

# THE RAMBLER.

---

VOL. III. *New Series.*      SEPTEMBER 1860.      PART IX.

---

## NATIONAL DEFENCE.

A PHILOSOPHER once said that he had never known any body who was made wiser by the experience of others, nor, he added after a moment's reflection, even by his own. The people of England have lately shown an example of the former virtue, certainly the most unusual and most difficult of the two; for the defeat of the Austrians in Lombardy has brought about changes in this country more weighty and more extensive than in Austria herself. Strange to say, we became filled with dismay and suspicion in the midst of a war which we applauded and of triumphs at which we rejoiced. By far the majority of Englishmen looked forward hopefully to the deliverance of Italy, whilst in Ireland vast numbers of seditious ballads celebrated the progress of the allies. Our neighbour's house was on fire, and we laughed at his distress. All our sympathies were on one side, though our interests were all on the other. But there is a sound sense of what suits their own advantage in the character of Englishmen, and the influence of false principles and of political prejudices could not long prevail. Before the Italian war was over, a movement commenced among the people which we consider one of the most honourable and one of the most momentous events in our history. The Rifle Volunteers are a new feature in the constitution of the body politic, and the sign of an altered time. Their motto, "Defence, not defiance," could not conceal for a moment the real motive and character of the institution.

Five years ago our fleet and our army were suffering and conquering side by side with the French. The Emperor was received with vociferous applause in London, and the peaceful purposes of the works at Cherbourg were so little disputed

that the Queen went over to admire them. In 1857 we despatched all our available forces to India, and obtained for some of them permission to traverse France. Such was the confidence that then prevailed, that a popular outcry was raised because the Government refused to send the steamships of war to the Indian Ocean. In that time of danger and disaster the Emperor stood loyally by us, as he had done in the Russian war. His phrases and declamations about the alliance and the progress of civilisation, which were believed and echoed in this country, were never belied by his policy towards us. Even the Italian expedition was popular here. Those who, like the *Saturday Review*, understood its real character, and believed that the Austrians were fighting our battles, were unable to withstand the charm of success, and triumphed with the French. The imputation of Austrian sympathies was used not unsuccessfully against Lord Derby's government at the moment of its fall by the partisans of men whom it would be more just to accuse of antipathy for Austria. Then came the news of Solferino and Villafranca, and a few weeks later a change had come over the spirit of the land; the Government that had been helped to office by the Italian sentiments of its three most conspicuous members began to consider the necessity of spending millions for the fortification of our dockyards, and for the indefinite increase of our fleet; and a nation of pacific shopkeepers were arming against the magnanimous ally who had just humbled Austria, delivered Italy, and threatened the Pope.

The fairest test of the importance and vitality of the movement which then took its rise is supplied by considering the difficulties and the improbability of success which attended its commencement. Men who were notoriously friendly to the Emperor were at the head of the Government. Lord Palmerston had figured in a scarlet coat at Compiègne at the very time when the invasion of Lombardy was projected, and his constant endeavour at the Foreign Office had been to thwart and injure Austria. The Foreign Secretary was well known as the time-honoured advocate of those principles of an ordinary and superficial Liberalism which pervade the Continent, and have served in France as the soundest foundation of despotism. All men were aware that he would not be an inflexible upholder of the faith of treaties; that he respected popular aspirations more than established rights; and that, in conformity to the Foxite tradition, he would prefer a revolutionary to a legitimate prince.

Above all, the purse-strings of the nation were in the hands of Mr. Gladstone. As to his opinions there could be no



mistake. He was one of the earliest enthusiasts of Italian independence. He had denounced the King of Naples; he had translated Farini; he had proclaimed Leopardi. He was the associate of men who in the term "patriot" combine an indistinct fusion of the conspirator and the assassin. It was hardly possible, therefore, but that he should feel a particular attraction towards the Emperor Napoleon. Mr. Gladstone was perhaps the only eminent man who entertained that species of admiration for him which is so common among those who think that villany and success are infallible proofs of ability. This tendency was strengthened by considerations of home policy. As an economist, and as the organ by which the Manchester party were led captive, he was compelled to resist every unnecessary expense for preparations for war. His financial reputation depended on his being able to redeem in 1860 the pledges of 1853. Moreover, Mr. Gladstone has a natural aversion for war, and a love of economy, beyond what is expected of a Chancellor of the Exchequer, and almost enough to satisfy even the demands of the Manchester school. He was likely, therefore, both from interest and from conviction, to argue that the Emperor deserved confidence, and even gratitude for his Italian campaign, and that there was no need of defensive armaments against him. Indeed, this was so obviously his interest, that it was certain to become, by a transition which in his mind is necessary and instantaneous, his sincere and deliberate conviction. For Mr. Gladstone is equally remarkable for the highest moral integrity and rectitude and for the utmost intellectual duplicity. He is at the same time the most honest and the most deceitful of public men. His excessive earnestness of conviction is the great secret of the persuasiveness of his eloquence; but that earnestness is founded on an incredible power of persuading himself. Unfortunately he can convince himself as well as others of what he wishes to believe, or to be believed. He cannot see the flaw in his own case, though in an adversary's nothing escapes him. Hence that fatal instability of purpose which is, rather than inconsistency of opinion, the bane of his career. In this question he has exhibited perfect consistency, and has displayed ostentatiously his disbelief in the grounds for alarm which have provoked such vast expenditure, and his disgust at the ignorant patience of taxation shown by the people.

An administration so constituted, and enjoying the support of Mr. Bright, promised nothing but peace and conciliation with France, and offered no great likelihood of a budget of 77 millions this year. It seemed probable that we should

merely engage in an amicable emulation with the Emperor Napoleon, to see who should do most for the happiness of Italy; and whether the Subalpine kingdom would have more reason to be grateful to those who by diplomacy wished to obtain the unity of Italy, or to him who made war for Italian liberty, but preferred to keep the Austrians at Venice, in order that he might continue to be a necessary, and therefore a predominant ally. The Government simply announced that it would continue the preparations made by their predecessors in office to place our navy on a level with that of France. Things might have gone on in this way, and Mr. Gladstone's counsels might have prevailed to the last, but for an unforeseen event which occurred out of doors. This was the establishment of permanent volunteer rifle corps.

Neither the history of this nor of any other country offered a precedent for this, and there seemed to be hardly more encouragement for it in the state of public opinion than in the policy of the Cabinet. Soldiering has never been popular amongst us. Except in times of war, the army has been generally looked upon with jealousy by the people. No efforts have ever been made in peaceful times to provide a large force, such as subsists in most European countries. It has never been felt as a necessity for home-defence. Until the Russian war, the state of the Continent did not affect the size of our army. The navy was thought sufficient to protect us, and the numbers of the army were fixed according to the exigencies of colonial service. People were totally unaccustomed to the notion that a home-force is required for our security. The only power that could think of invading us was the Emperor of the French, and with him there was no quarrel. When last volunteers were called out in England, there were pressing reasons for it, and the panic was not absurd. The first Napoleon was at Boulogne with an army that was about to win Austerlitz, and he had prepared all things for a descent on England. The peril was great and immediate, and soon over, and the volunteers were not long under arms. But now there was no provocation, no declared enemy, no threat of invasion. If any thing required to be provided for, it was no momentary or transitory danger, but an altered state of the world, and whatever was done must be done for good. There was nothing to excite enthusiasm, and enthusiasm was not enough. Great and permanent sacrifices were necessary, or the rifle movement would be merely a pastime and a farce. Every thing that weighs most with the practical Englishman appeared to discourage it: the Crown did not call for volunteers; the Government



held aloof. Great military authorities spoke most unfavourably of their probable efficiency. The democratic party reviled and sneered at them. They had to run the gauntlet of ridicule in every street of London. No eminent or conspicuous person took the lead. Nevertheless a year has scarcely elapsed, and the Volunteers have triumphed over all these obstacles. The War-office has organised and directed the formation of the corps; the Queen has reviewed them in Hyde Park and at Holyrood; Sir John Burgoyne has withdrawn his first opinion; ridicule is silent, and the street-boys hold their tongues.

It has been the work of the aristocratic classes, and it has been made possible by the events of last summer, and by the discovery that France would make war for an idea. It is right that those who are the natural leaders of the people should take the foremost place in a work in which rank has no privileges, and in which service is not paid. The progress of events deprives them of many artificial advantages which they held from their position in society, and which they will recover as volunteers. They will do more for the rifle movement than they will get from it; for they possess in the highest degree the qualifications which it demands—leisure, money, and that power of excelling in a pursuit without being trained for it which belongs peculiarly to the rowing, hunting, boxing, adventurous young gentlemen of England. An aristocracy ceases to be an aristocracy if it fails to take the lead in the movement of the age. In Sparta certain trades were forbidden, because they would have raised up a new nobility; and it is for a similar reason that in the middle ages there was so close a union between the nobles and the Church. The democratic character of the Catholic clergy was the safety of the nobles, because it gave an opening and a career to all the talents in the lower orders. In the same way, by the free competition which throws open all the chances of success to ambition, an aristocracy is still preserved in its integrity and its strength by allowing itself to be revived by the same means by which it was originally created. Nobility is properly an element of progress, for it subsists only on condition of moving in the front rank. Where it feels unable to keep the lead, it tries to maintain itself by impeding the general advance. Aristocracy, says Chateaubriand, has three successive ages: the age of superiority, the age of privileges, the age of vanities; proceeding from the first, it degenerates in the second, and expires in the third. Ours is still in the first age. The most promising sign for the success of the volunteer movement is the part



taken by the upper class in conducting it. Its chief danger and its greatest defect is its exclusive character, and the insufficient support it has received from the lower classes. Unless it extends farther and deeper, it will not be strongly rooted. It can only confirm the influence of the higher classes if all join in it, and if the aristocratic commanders are placed at the head of other orders of the people besides their own. This is the rock ahead of the whole innovation. While peace lasts, labouring men cannot afford time for drill or money for accoutrements; and when the period for action arrives, they will not easily or willingly combine with a force which has already assumed a distinctly exclusive character. This difficulty must be overcome, or else the Volunteers will disorganise instead of uniting the community; they will widen and define the interval between the classes; they will provoke instead of disarming revolutionary tendencies, and will be the army of a class, not of a nation.

But the political consequences of the creation of a volunteer army extend far beyond the mere confirmation of aristocratic influence. It places in the hands of those classes most attached to the constitution the means of resisting, in all time to come, the exercise of arbitrary power. Jealousy of a standing army has been one of the chief securities of our institutions. Liberty can never be secure in the presence of a large force of mercenaries. The disappearance of the unbought armies of the feudal age, and the introduction of troops who served for pay, led to the establishment of absolute monarchy in Europe. It rendered the sovereign wholly independent of the nation, and separated the people from the State. It would be a dreadful thing, said Burke, if there were any power in this country of strength enough to oppose with effect the general wishes of the people. This is just what an army receiving the pay of the State is intended to do. The time has now arrived when we shall be always obliged to keep a considerable armed force at home. Who can say what circumstances may not hereafter arise which may make its presence dangerous here, as it has been every where else? Who can believe for an instant that Reform or Emancipation would ever have been carried if the Government had had a force at hand proportioned to the armies of other states? We must have lost the instinctive foresight which has made us great in politics, if we had not provided, together with the means of defence against the enemy, a security against their abuse. By our volunteer army we have doubled our military force, and have doubled also our constitutional safeguards.

We have provided at the same time the most effectual security against insurrection. The Volunteers are no protection to the State against the people, but to property against spoliation, and to society against socialism. They have armed the upper and middle classes, and will arm as many of the lower class as are ready to join the others. They will make revolution as impossible as invasion, and will be as effective a barrier against ochlocracy as against tyranny. They will verify the prophecy made by a great writer nearly a century ago, that "nothing is more certain than that in a hundred years a national militia will be every where the chief element of defence, and will form a new security for freedom and property, which, if our present mode of government continues, must otherwise be destroyed."

Other countries have sought for protection against a standing army in the establishment of a national guard. With this the Volunteers bear no analogy whatever; they are the creation of a totally different state of society. When the mass of the nation is in opposition to the sovereign power, it requires an armed force in order to be able to hold its own. Originally the creation of the national guard was an act of defiance and a proof of suspicion against the crown. In later times it has been the army of the *bourgeoisie* against the mob, the bulwark of property, independently of the authority of the State, and even in spite of it. The national guard is therefore in its nature revolutionary. It serves neither the State nor the nation, but a single interest and a single class of society. Where the sovereignty is in the hands of the nation, and there is no jealousy consequently either of the State or of the masses, that is to say, in all democracies, army and national guard are one and the same. But the Volunteers have taken up the rifle against a foreign adversary; they are not the result of suspicion, and whilst they exist they will prevent the rise of an antagonism between the people and the State, and between property and labour, and will be a bond of union as well as a protection.

They will save us, not only from a national guard, but from the greater evil of conscription. A people that relies on a permanent system of compulsory military service, resembles the statesman who declared himself ready to sacrifice not only a part, but the whole of the constitution, in order to preserve the remainder. It is a system by which one great liberty is surrendered and all are imperilled, and it is a surrender, not of rights only, but also of power. In every sense, therefore, the Volunteers are a safeguard of our institutions as well



as of our independence, and are as important in a political as they are in a military point of view.

Standing armies alone have not preserved any European country from a successful invasion. In 1805 Napoleon crossed the Rhine, 25th September, and dictated the peace of Presburg, 26th December. In 1806 he entered Berlin a fortnight after the first encounter with the Prussians. In 1814 the allies took only three months to march from the Rhine to Paris. Centralisation increases the power of attack, but diminishes that of defence. In 1809 Tyrol held out longer than Austria in 1805 or France in 1814. It is, however, a question of civilisation even more than of centralisation. A highly civilised people possesses great resources for offensive purposes; a barbarous people is powerful in defence. It is impossible to concentrate in a regular army all the moral, or even the material, resources of a nation. They can act only spontaneously, and are not to be had to order. They can be reckoned upon only in a free country. An absolute monarch either will not venture to call the nation to arms, or if he does, it must lead to great internal changes, if not to revolution. But in a free country it is the natural mode of defence. There a large standing army is not tolerated, and every class is identified with the Government. All that the State can do is, therefore, to assist and to sustain, as far as art can do it, the resistance of the whole people.

In this respect the ministers have wisely and worthily followed the expectation and the example of the people. The efforts which have been made with so much enthusiasm and with so many substantial sacrifices, have been supported in such a way as to increase their military importance without affecting their political character. The way in which volunteers can be made equal to regulars is to supply them with artificial defences. Some of the greatest sieges in history have been sustained by men not trained to arms. The chief authority amongst us on fortification, Sir John Burgoyne, who began by declaring that a volunteer army would not stand against one-tenth their number of regular troops, considers that they would be perfectly sufficient for the defence of fortresses. Therefore, by means of a large immediate expenditure on fortifications, troops that cost the country hardly any thing are raised to an equality with the line, for a special service, and our army will become the cheapest instead of the dearest in the world.

To be chary of the lives of the people is a characteristic which belongs to a free nation as much as prodigality of human life belongs to the character of a despotic prince. All



that money and art can accomplish ought to be done to protect those to whom we look for protection. It behoves us to relieve our soldiers as much as possible of the burdens and sufferings of war. In this also the experience of last year ought to warn us. The loss of the allies at Solferino exceeded by many thousands that of the defeated army. The legitimate monarch was bound to spare his men; the despot could afford to waste lives to gain his purpose. It is hard, and it would be wrong, for Englishmen to meet such a foe on equal terms. We spend millions to save human life in time of peace, by means of lighthouses, breakwaters, and harbours of refuge; we have no right to grudge the millions that are to furnish shelter for our soldiers, especially our Volunteers. The fortifications are the natural and necessary complement of the enrolment of the new force.

They are not even open to the charge of expense compared with the enormous increase of the fleet which is asked for on the one hand, or the addition to the army which is demanded on the other. Their purpose is purely defensive. Every thing that gives an advantage to defence is of an essentially pacific tendency. The only way in which our power of resistance could be increased without increasing the means, and therefore the temptation, of aggression, was by creating a volunteer force, and fortifying the chief points of the coast. Every thing else would tend to provoke war; these tend to prevent it. They serve as a shield, not as a sword. In the debates on the fortifications of Paris, M. Guizot said, that if other countries would imitate the example of France, by fortifying their capitals, war would become impossible. In the same discussion it was affirmed, that the measure would be really economical, because it would allow the army to be reduced by 200,000 men. We are doing what we can by strengthening our sea-defences, and accepting the voluntary service of the people; and by these measures combined we shall be able to defy our great military neighbour, and to escape the danger of his proximity and of his example.

We cannot, however, escape a great change in our whole system, neither can we disguise the fact that now is the commencement of a new era of our national existence. It has been argued that riflemen and fortifications are to be eschewed, because it is un-English to skulk behind stone-walls, or to hide while taking a shot. Still we must accept a mode of warfare that has been introduced in consequence of an altered state of things, both in the political world and in military science, which deprives this country of much of its ancient character.

We have lost that immunity from invasion which we so long enjoyed. However improbable or hazardous the attempt may be, it is no longer absolutely impracticable. Steam has thrown a bridge across the Channel from every French port to every point of the 300 miles of our coast where an enemy could land. A great military writer, convinced of the danger of trusting to the fleet alone, has said that we should be safer if we had no fleet. There can, however, be little doubt that the altered mode of warfare will ultimately result in our advantage, and will increase our superiority. But this will not restore our former security until it has been proved.

It is not, however, the introduction of steam men-of-war, which have existed for many years, or any calculations of military men, that has produced so extraordinary a revolution in the habits and feelings of our countrymen. They believed until last year that the good faith of our neighbours would preserve us from attack, and that our fleet would be enough for our defence. But although Austria is unpopular because it is supposed to be not only a despotic but a retrograde state, and a great protector of Popery, and although a nation struggling for independence is a grateful spectacle to Englishmen, yet the invasion of Lombardy was secretly felt to be a crime, and the arguments by which it was justified were obviously just as capable of being applied to any similar act elsewhere. The feeling of security and confidence was destroyed for ever. There were more occasions for dispute between France and England than between France and Austria; for there is hardly a point of the compass where our interests are not in contradiction with each other. It is more easy to find a powerful ally against England than against Austria; and the revolutionary and national principle can be appealed to as well in one case as in the other. Besides, the popular antipathy is most violent against us, whilst against the Austrians it does not exist. Last, and above all, there is an irrepressible antagonism between the principles of government and the social habits of the two countries. England and Austria represent two different ages; England and France represent two different civilisations. Neither the French nor the English have forgotten the part we played in the last generations, when the words which Demosthenes spoke to the Athenians might have been applied to England: "It is your constitution above all against which Philip makes war. He knows that his power can never be secure whilst popular government subsists among you. To you it is not given to seize power over others; but in this you are powerful, to forbid another to get possession of power, or, if he has it, to wrest



it from him. For every oppressor your government is a hindrance, and a safety for all who are oppressed."

Our danger lies not so much in the ambition of the French Emperor as in the state of the French people. Under Louis Philippe, the democracy which afforded an insecure basis for the throne already began to give way to a military despotism, the natural end of democracies. In the midst of the constant insurrections in Paris, after the Revolution of 1830, the plan of fortifying Paris by means of detached forts was presented to the Chamber. The republicans rejected the measure because, they said, it was directed against the population of Paris. But in 1840 it was revived by M. Thiers, and was adopted on condition that in addition to the detached forts Paris should be surrounded by walls. This was supposed to be a guarantee that the whole plan was designed against a foreign enemy. M. Guizot very frankly explained the political character of the fortifications. "For ten years," he said, "we have laboured, in spite of all opposition, to establish a policy of order and of peace. Do not refuse to the defenders of this cause the only means of making it prevail. For ten years the party of a rational policy has been predominant in Europe; but there are at the same time both in France and elsewhere many men of evil designs and warlike passions, who always think revolutions possible, and always try to produce them. And there are also, under the name of conservatives, thoughtless and passionate men, who expect or even hope for revolutions in France as a consequence of war. These men must be cured of their errors. The government, the constitution, the head and the heart of France, must be saved from these dangers. We must convince Europe that a revolution is not possible in France. The party of a good and conservative policy throughout Europe will receive an immense service, and the fortifications of Paris will be of use to all governments." In truth, it raised the personal government of the crown above all parties, and gave it a power which there were no means of controlling or of resisting, except by force. If the king had possessed ambition, energy, and popularity with the army, it would have been possible in 1846 to bring France to something very like her present condition. Every thing turned on the attachment of the army. Fourteen years ago, a great writer, who well understood the meaning of what he saw, pointed out the consequences of this state of things in a centralised country. "The fatal strength of the fortifications of Paris will," he wrote, "scarcely be tried while Louis Philippe lives. Such a trial would be, under all circumstances, a great peril for the king himself. But



how with his successors? Can it be hoped that they will pursue the same course?"

War is the great instrument by which a power such as this is retained. It is one of the necessities of the position of a ruler of France, and no prince can hesitate to employ the means which are required for his very existence. "Something new must be done every three months," said the first Napoleon, "to captivate the imagination of the French people; with them, he that does not advance is lost." Things will not be improved by the death or the fall of Napoleon III. Abler and more unscrupulous men may be found among those who look for the reversion of his power. The worst that can be said of him is, that he absolutely ignores all moral considerations in pursuing the policy which is dictated by the instinct of self-preservation. He obtained his crown by immoral means; it is idle to complain that he preserves it in the same manner. He is strong and popular in France; it is absurd to separate him from the people as the object of special indignation. Nothing can be less inscrutable or more easy to calculate than his policy; nothing more certain than that some day a war with England will suit his interests, and that when that time comes he will not hesitate to declare it.

---

#### THE PRISON-DISCIPLINE ACT.

WE take it as an admitted principle, that it is no part of the punishment which the law intends to inflict on any malefactor that he shall be deprived of the means of worshiping God according to the dictates of his conscience, or that he shall be either directly or indirectly punished for his religion as well as for his offence. Yet under the existing system of prison-discipline both these things are done. The imprisoned Catholic is denied the means of worship; and if, whilst he is undergoing his sentence, he abstains from acts distinctly forbidden by his Church, his punishment is greatly increased.

In fact, a judge might very well express himself much as follows in passing sentence on a Catholic prisoner:

*Judge.* Prisoner at the bar, you have been convicted of a very serious offence, and it is my duty to sentence you to three months' imprisonment. Are you a member of the Church of England, or do you belong to any other denomination?

*Prisoner.* Please your lordship, I am no denomination; I am a Catholic.

*Judge.* In that case, then, I have further to sentence you

to three months' abstinence from the worship of God, except so far as you can do this in the solitude of your cell; and also, unless you can get over your scruples and attend the services of the Church of England, to solitary confinement in your cell for three hours every Sunday, and for from three quarters of an hour to an hour on other days. But you will be asked once a week whether you require the assistance of a minister of your denomination; and if you answer affirmatively, your minister, if he can conveniently be communicated with, will be allowed, at your or his own expense, to pay you a visit for each such affirmative answer.

No English judge could prevail on himself to make such an address to a prisoner; it would be too humiliating to himself, too overt a sarcasm on the laws he would be administering. Lord Campbell himself could hardly put the facts so as to elicit a welcome but dear-bought cheer from an ultra-Protestant audience.

Let us see how this indefensible, and no doubt in great measure accidental, state of things has arisen.

The sentence on the Catholic prisoner depends on the construction of two acts of parliament, supposing that his sentence, independently of the addition made to it because he is a Catholic, is passed upon him under some act of parliament. The first act would award him a sentence common to himself and others; the second, or that under which he is in effect sentenced to further punishment for being a Catholic (we need not say that no such words as we have put into the mouth of the judge are ever used), grows out of the Prison-Discipline Act, 4 Geo. IV. c. 64.

We have said that the wrong is no doubt in great measure accidental. It has, in fact, grown out of the words of an act of parliament, not out of the intention of the Legislature.

This view is supportable out of the act itself, and is strengthened, well-nigh up to the point of demonstration, by the analogy to be drawn from other acts of the Legislature, and by the admitted principles of legislation. In fact, in speaking of this view as "supportable" by the evidence of the act itself, and as "well-nigh" demonstrable only, we understate the case we are about to establish. On the words of the act itself, we are able to claim its own revision as a logically necessary consequence to be drawn from its own expressions. But this neither is, nor should be, enough to establish the claim we are about to advance: for there are two ways of restoring logical agreement between the expressed intention and the contradictory or inconsistent enactment of



the same document; the one would be by alterations which would make it conformable to what we shall show to be its intention by its own words, the other by expunging or altering those sentences on which we shall rely as expressing the intention of parliament. But we shall further show that this latter process is inadmissible on grounds drawn from the analogy of other acts of parliament; and we shall also, throwing aside all technical reasons, show that an alteration of the cited act in the sense of meting out only an equal degree of punishment to Catholics and Protestants, besides being abstractedly just, would also turn out for the good of the community, Catholic and Protestant alike. And we purpose in this article to omit all considerations which would affect the minds of Catholics only,—such, for instance, as the salvation of souls and the greater glory of God,—and to confine ourselves to principles admitted by Protestants, and to reasoning which a Catholic might address to an ultra-Protestant who accepted the propositions that a man should no longer be punishable in England for being a Catholic, and that, outside the Act of Settlement, and any endowments or privileges conferred by law on the Establishment, all orders, lay or clerical, should be equal in the eye of the law; so that, apart from the succession to the crown, and the reservations of the Emancipation Act, it should be an idle and futile question to ask a man his religion as a base on which to ground any penal treatment, or any exclusion from any office or employment not necessarily importing his adhesion to the established religion.

The preamble of the Prison-Discipline Act (4 Geo. IV. c. 64) recites as follows. We have put into italics those words to which we shall have occasion particularly to refer:

“Whereas the laws now existing relative to the building, repairing, and *regulating* of gaols and houses of correction in England and Wales are complicated, and have in many cases been *found ineffective*: and whereas it is expedient that such measures should be adopted and such arrangements made in prisons as shall not only provide for the safe custody, but shall also tend more effectually to *preserve the health* and to *improve the morals*, of the prisoners confined therein, and shall *insure the proper measure of punishment* to convicted offenders: and whereas due classification, inspection, regular labour and employment, and *religious and moral instruction* are *essential* to the *discipline of a prison*, and to the *reformation of offenders*: and whereas,” &c. &c.;

the remainder being immaterial.

The act, then, is for the *regulation* of prisons, the existing rules having been found *ineffective*. The points of inef-



iciency are pretty obvious from what follows, even if it were not otherwise known that gaols were dirty and unhealthy, and had become, not only places of confinement and punishment, but hotbeds of vice and immorality. Accordingly the object of the act is to *preserve the health* and to *improve the morals* of prisoners. And the way to set about this last job is expressly declared to be to provide *religious and moral instruction*, which is declared to be not only *essential* to the *reformation* of offenders, but also to the *discipline of a prison*.

As it is our object in discussing this act to confine ourselves to its effects on Catholics, in the two points (1) of awarding them more than a proper measure of punishment, and (2) of depriving them of that moral and religious instruction which is declared essential for their reformation and for due discipline, we shall not go into any of the clauses of the act which do not bear on these two points. And before going into any examination of the clauses, it may be well to observe that the clearest possible expression of any intention in a preamble will not do away with the effect of any positive enactment. Thus, if parliament were to express the most benevolent intentions towards, say, the Jews, and were thereupon to enact that they should be transported, one and all, after having had their teeth drawn, the Jews would be transported and tortured under the enactment, and the benevolent intention would go to the wall, or it would be held that parliament thought the penalties inflicted good for them.

Now all the sections of the act which bear in any way on our subject are the following :

1. As part of the tenth it is enacted, that prisoners sentenced to hard labour shall be exempt from it on Sundays, Christmas-day, and Good Friday ; that prayers selected from the Liturgy of the Church of England by the chaplain shall be read at least every morning, and that portions of the Scripture shall be read to the prisoners when assembled for instruction ; and that convicted prisoners shall attend divine service on Sundays, and on other days when it is performed, unless excused.

2. The twenty-eighth section enacts that the justices shall appoint a chaplain, who shall be a clergyman of the Church of England.

3. The twenty-ninth requires that such clergyman shall obtain a license from his Bishop.

4. The thirtieth requires the chaplain to perform morning and evening service on Sundays, Christmas-day, and Good Friday, and to preach as he may be required by rules

made under the provisions of the act; to catechise and instruct prisoners willing to receive instruction; to visit the prison and perform such other duties as may be required of him by the rules; to administer Holy Communion to prisoners desirous of communicating, and whom he may judge fit; to visit frequently every room or cell occupied by prisoners, and to direct the distribution and reading of such books as he may judge proper for the moral and religious instruction of prisoners confined therein; to visit prisoners in solitary confinement, and particularly to visit convicts under order for execution;—"and he shall have free access to all persons convicted of murder, any law, statute, or usage to the contrary notwithstanding; except to such persons as shall be of a religious persuasion different from that of the Established Church, who shall have made a request that a minister of such persuasion shall be allowed to visit them;"—to communicate to the justices any impropriety or abuse which may come to his knowledge; and to keep a journal, in which he shall enter the times of his attendance, and any observations which may occur to him in the performance of his duty.

5. The thirty-first section enacts: "That if any prisoner shall be of a religious persuasion differing from that of the Established Church, a minister of such persuasion, at the special request of such prisoner, shall be allowed to visit him or her at proper and reasonable times, under such restrictions imposed by the visiting justices as shall guard against the introduction of improper persons, and as shall prevent improper communications."

6. And, lastly, the forty-ninth section requires that a convenient chapel shall be provided in every prison, for divine service, and for the occasional moral and religious instruction of the prisoners.

When the sections of an act are not in accord with the expressed intention of the preamble, it need perhaps occasion no surprise that they should exhibit some curious and incomprehensible feats amongst themselves. If it were not for this, we should think there was something surprising about the thirtieth section. The chaplain is particularly to visit all convicts under order for execution, and he is also to have free access to all prisoners convicted of murder (whether under order for execution or not), except to such persons as are of a religious persuasion different from that of the Established Church who shall have made a request to be visited by a minister of their own persuasion. If, then, a prisoner is under order for execution for any crime but murder (and it must be remembered that the act is dated in the year 1823),



he is not to have the privilege of immunity from the visits of the chaplain; whilst if he is under *conviction* for murder, whether he be ordered for execution or not, the section protects him from the chaplain, but does not provide any other religious instruction for him whatever. But this is only by the way, and as a peg on which to hang the observation that parliamentary bills which have passed through their second reading and committal should, for the credit of the Legislature, have their patchwork reduced to shape and consistency before being presented to the House for their third reading. Many absurdities, unintelligibilities, and even contradictions, would be thus avoided. In government bills it is presumed that this is done by the law-officers of the crown; yet we can remember more than one instance of results of the enacting parts of a bill which were not only never intended by parliament, but contrary to its intention.

Let us now follow the act in its operations on Catholic prisoners.

The act says that its object is to insure to each prisoner a proper measure of punishment,—and by “proper” no doubt is meant just and equal,—so that no prisoner shall escape the due measure of punishment intended by law, and that no one shall receive more.

The act does not say that its object is to provide moral and religious instruction for prisoners; but it says that such instruction is essential to discipline and reformation, and puts this necessity forward as a motive for the changes effected by the act.

Now as respects Catholic prisoners, the act is a failure on both points, and introduces a machinery which must result either in proselytising the Catholic prisoner, or in punishing him more severely than if he were a Protestant, and in cutting him off from moral and religious instruction, or, in the most favourable cases, in leaving him to obtain an inadequate supply.

If it were not for the exceptions in the act relating to prisoners of a religious persuasion different from that of the Establishment, the absurdities of the act might be got rid of by supposing that the Legislature meant by “religious and moral instruction” such instruction of that kind as could be afforded by the clergy of the Establishment: but this interpretation is altogether excluded by the exceptions in favour of prisoners whose religious persuasion differs from that of the Establishment; for it cannot be contended that it was the intention of parliament that these persons should not be supplied with an article *essential*, not only to their reforma-

tion, but to good discipline within the walls of the gaol. On the other hand, the most liberal interpretation of the act will not go beyond a permission to Catholic prisoners to receive the instructions of a priest if he can get them, and will in no case provide for *supplying* him with such instructions.

Let us follow a Catholic into prison, and observe his treatment; and this will lead us to distinguish those parts which are necessary consequences of the law, and those which have grown out of its administration.

There are three classes of prisons in England: firstly, county, city, or district prisons; secondly, prisons established under separate acts of parliament, and excluded from the operations of the act under review; thirdly, military prisons. We speak now of the first class only.

When a Catholic enters such a prison, he is asked to what religious denomination he belongs, and if he answers that he is a Catholic, or a Roman Catholic, the effect of his answer is registered against his name. This registration of his creed is made under the rules of the prison, not under any express provision of the act. We are unable to say whether the rules of all prisons under the act require this registration, but we believe that they do. It is, however, morally certain that many Catholic prisoners, by their own fault or that of the authorities, are entered as Protestants.

There is but one printed return of the numbers of prisoners of various denominations in confinement at any one time. In 1853, the late Frederick Lucas moved and carried an address for a "Return showing in each prison in the United Kingdom, on the 25th day of September 1852, the number of prisoners of each religious denomination; the names of the clergymen, or other religious instructors, appointed or officiating in each prison during the previous year to promote the reformation of the prisoners of each denomination through the instrumentality of their own respective creeds; the religious denomination to which each such clergyman or religious instructor belongs; the salary or allowance made to him during the year, distinguishing the sums applied for this purpose out of the money voted by parliament from those derived from county-rate, county-cess, or other local sources; the title, office, or service, in virtue of which such salary or allowance has been made; and the date of the appointment of each such clergyman or religious instructor, or, of the commencement of his allowance, if an annual one." This return now lies before us, and shows, as respects the number of prisoners registered as professing one creed or another, the following result:



*Number of prisoners of each religious denomination on the 25th  
September 1852, viz.*

Church of England . . . .	16,077
Presbyterian . . . .	496
Dissenters (all classes) . . . .	1,391
Roman Catholics . . . .	2,955
Jews . . . .	45
Described as of no religion . . . .	323
Not stated of what denomination . . . .	339
Total . . . .	<hr/> 21,626

These results may be perhaps usefully put in the following form, which exhibits out of 1000 prisoners the proportional number belonging to each of the above classes :

Church of England . . . .	743
Presbyterian . . . .	23
Dissenters (all classes) . . . .	64
Roman Catholics . . . .	137
Jews . . . .	2
Described as of no religion . . . .	15
Not stated of what denomination . . . .	16
Total . . . .	<hr/> 1000

We thus see, assuming that the returns are correct, and that the number of Catholic prisoners confined on one day will not sensibly differ from the average in confinement one day with another throughout the year, that there may be expected to be 2955 Catholics in confinement at any one time.

But it is certain, on closer inspection of the returns, that this number is an under-statement.

Thus, in the county gaol of Chelmsford, out of 1464 prisoners in confinement, only 17 are returned as Catholics. The number, to correspond with the average, should be 200. In Newgate no creed-register appears to be kept, and the religion of none of the 122 prisoners in confinement is distinguished. There would probably be about 24 Catholics confined. In Portland prison only 40 prisoners out of 829 are set down as Catholics; whereas we believe that nearly one half of the prisoners, this being a military prison, were Catholics. Newgate and Portland, however, not being county prisons, do not come within the scope of our examination.

The inaccuracy of the returns may also be inferred from

the enormous preponderance of prisoners set down as belonging to the Established Church. It is incredible to suppose that 743 persons out of every 1000 in confinement are in any sense whatever members of the Establishment. There are no published statistics which enable us to infer the number of Catholics who are subject to prison-discipline in the course of a year from the number in prison on any one day. This number would depend on two unknown quantities; viz. the average duration of imprisonment, and the number of committals during one year of the same person. The population of our gaols is not taken out of the whole population, but the prisons have their *habitués*, and some persons make them their residence many times in the same year.

We shall have again to recur to this question of numbers when we come to another part of our subject. We have allowed ourselves this digression to bring palpably before the mind of the reader the *magnitude* of the question. It is only a reasonable guess if we venture to suppose that about 20,000 Catholics annually pass through the process we are about to describe in our county prisons.

Our Catholic prisoner, having had his religion registered, passes from the amenities of the lodge to his cell. He finds here a copy of the rules of the prison; and one of these rules allows him to object to attend Protestant prayers and services, and to request the attendance of a minister of his own denomination or religious persuasion. And here Catholic prisoners divide themselves into two classes: the one, who *desire* to amend, and, as a means thereto, to receive instruction and the Sacraments; the other, who would prefer an interview with any one in preference to the priest. We need not say that these latter are by far the larger class,—that they have no objection to attend any services whatever which will afford them some relaxation from labour or solitary confinement, and that they make no request to see a priest, but listen with hardened and impudent effrontery to the instruction offered by the Protestant chaplain; or perhaps receive gladly his attacks on their faith, in the hope of staying the cravings for better things which would lead them to repentance and the Sacraments; or perhaps with quiet humour note the more salient points which afford the opportunity of a good story to be told outside; or perhaps, particularly if this is not their first appearance within the walls of a prison, play with cunning talent on the zeal of the parson, profess grave doubts as to whether they should ever have been there if they had known him earlier, and had sooner had their eyes opened to the tricks of the priests.



But the other class—those who desire to amend, and, as a means thereto, to receive instruction and the Sacraments—are naturally divided again into two classes: those who have the courage, energy, and firmness to carry out their desires; and the timid and procrastinating. The latter intend to do what is necessary, but never in fact succeed in mustering strength to do it. They attend the Protestant prayers and services with an unquiet conscience, and listen with bewilderment to the private instructions of the Protestant chaplain. They are perhaps attracted by his kindness, perhaps dominated by his stronger will and energy. Their convictions become shaken, some perhaps become a sort of Protestant, whilst his daily influence keeps them from confessing their faith, and holds them to the acknowledgments they have been surprised into making. They come out of prison less able to cope with temptation, and with little or no faith. They have lost something, but have got nothing instead of it.

Let us next attempt to trace the action of the law, and the rules which have grown out of it, on those who have the courage, energy, and firmness to carry out their desire to have the ministrations of a priest, and to get the help of the Sacraments. First and foremost, they will claim their right as Catholics to absent themselves from Protestant prayers and services. But the assembling of the prisoners for prayers and religious services is precisely that time when, more than at any other, they require all the supervision of all the authorities. It is the well-known and recognised time at which all the ingenuity and vigilance of the administration cannot succeed in preventing a system of communication between the prisoners, which, more than any thing, tends to destroy the discipline of the prison, and to impede the reformation of offenders. The boldest and most ingenious thief and burglar, the oldest hand, the man who is paying his twentieth visit to the gaol, and is able to impart the traditions he has learnt, takes the lead. A code of signals, perfected by the ingenuity of ingenious men, is soon established. It is even said that burglaries are planned, and it is certain that the rendezvous outside is communicated and agreed on, and that gangs are thus recruited.

The consequence of this to the Catholic absentee is, that he must be locked up in his cell; and the fact is, that he is locked up in his cell during the whole time of Protestant prayers and services, whilst the worse disposed of his fellow-prisoners are really enjoying themselves and completing their education, and whilst the better disposed are at

least receiving some relaxation from forced and unwilling labour or from solitary confinement. Let us see what this extra punishment really amounts to, and for this purpose let us take the case of a prisoner who is sentenced to three months' confinement.

In all gaols, for aught we know, but certainly in all considerable ones, the morning and evening prayers of the Church of England, or at least a selection from them, are read. This will relegate the Catholic absentee to about one hour's solitary confinement on all days except Sundays. Taking three months at ninety-one days, including Sundays, here are seventy-eight hours' (excluding Sundays) more solitary confinement than is inflicted on the Protestant or lax Catholic; seventy-eight hours is about four days (rather more), counting the day at sixteen hours; for we throw overboard the eight hours during which all prisoners are asleep in their beds, and which are not hours of punishment. Then there are the Sundays, with two full services, taking up about three hours each Sunday. As there are thirteen Sundays, this makes thirty-nine hours, or about two days and a half, extra solitary confinement to which the Catholic absentee is practically sentenced. He gets as nearly as possible one week's more solitary confinement during his three months' imprisonment than is inflicted on a Protestant or lax Catholic.

But he has the right to request the attendance of a Catholic priest. Before we consider the effect and value of this privilege, let us observe that, quite independently of any direct effect on the morals of prisoners, it would greatly facilitate the discipline and good order of a prison if Catholic prisoners were provided with Catholic services. The Catholic and Protestant services would naturally follow one the other; and thus the prisoners would be divided into two large and distinct classes, each of which could be better supervised than the much larger number of both Protestants and Catholics who now attend the only services provided. Take Tothill Fields Prison, or Westminster House of Correction, as it is called. In the parliamentary return we have indicated, it is stated that on the 25th September 1852 there were 766 prisoners in confinement; of these 412 were members of the Established Church, 302 were Catholics, 42 were Dissenters, 2 were Presbyterians, and 2 were Jews. It would be much more possible to keep good watch during the hours of divine service on two or three separate bodies of 412, 302, and 44 each, than on one body of 766, less the very few persons who claimed the privilege of absence, and incurred the extra



punishment for conscience' sake. This is well known to and acknowledged by the governors of more than one of our largest prisons, who do not hesitate to admit, though they desire that such opinions should not be reported to their immediate superiors the visiting justices, that the separation of prisoners for divine service would very greatly assist them in maintaining discipline and preventing improper communications. And here, perhaps, we may also forestall an objection to providing Catholic services and Catholic religious instruction to Catholic prisoners which the instance quoted may suggest. It will perhaps be said, If we grant you Catholic services and chaplains, may not every class of Dissenters claim the same? How many chaplains do you want? We answer—

1. That Protestant Dissenters do not object to attend the services of the Church of England, and that their clergy and unimprisoned fellow-laymen do not object for them; that they are not taught, and do not in fact believe, that there is any sin in joining such services, whilst the contrary is the case with Catholics; and that it is no answer to any complaint founded on admitted principles and actually preferred, to say that some other people, who do not in fact do so, might complain if equal privileges were not conferred on them, or if equal justice were not done them.

2. That if it were required, or if it were thought to be expedient, to do so, it would be not only possible but easy to appoint a third or even a fourth chaplain to a gaol to meet the supposed wants of Presbyterians and Dissenters. If any one doubts this, the simple and sufficient answer is ready: *It has been done in Ireland*, and has been found to work admirably.

3. That the claim of Catholics is immeasurably stronger, on all grounds but those of principle, than any other religious body can advance. We are out of all comparison a more numerous body, and our religion is entitled to this political consideration—that it is the original religion of the country, the preponderating religion in Ireland and Canada, and that it is that of nearly one-third of the Queen's Christian subjects, of nearly half the army, and of about one-fourth of the officers and seamen of the fleet.

We may illustrate the magnitude of our claim, as founded on comparative numbers, by the following selection from the parliamentary return already quoted. We shall confine our examples to county and district prisons, which will exclude many in which Catholic prisoners exist in large numbers:

	No. of members of Established Church.	No. of Catholics.
County Gaol, Chester . . . . .	74	36
Knutsford House of Correction . . . . .	194	116
Derby County and Borough Gaol . . . . .	120	17
Devon County Gaol . . . . .	126	15
Hants County Gaol . . . . .	202	19
Kent County Prisons . . . . .	321	56
Lancaster Castle . . . . .	39	16
Kirkdale Gaol . . . . .	213	173
Liverpool Borough Gaol . . . . .	421	333
Preston House of Correction . . . . .	219	65
Salford New Bailey Prison . . . . .	332	161
Leicester County Gaol . . . . .	147	21
Bridewell Hospital* . . . . .	30	10
Coldbath Fields . . . . .	911	214
Westminster House of Correction . . . . .	412	302
County Gaol, Morpeth . . . . .	29	19
Newcastle-upon-Tyne . . . . .	83	34
Nottingham County Gaol . . . . .	26	8
Ipswich House of Correction . . . . .	53	29
„ Borough Gaol . . . . .	10	5
Horsemonger Lane Gaol . . . . .	39	13
Wandsworth House of Correction . . . . .	466	99
Warwick County Gaol . . . . .	156	17
Worcester County Gaol . . . . .	169	19
Beverley House of Correction . . . . .	60	21
Hull Gaol . . . . .	89	28
Wakefield House of Correction . . . . .	397	111
Totals . . . . .	5338	1957

We have purposely introduced into this list several cases in which the *proportion* of Catholics is small, as is ordinarily the case in inland and agricultural districts.

Here, then, are 5338 Protestants and 1957 Catholics confined in 27 gaols. The Protestants are supplied with religious instruction in these gaols at an annual cost of 8044*l.*;† the Catholics are totally unprovided for.

Let us compare the treatment of these 1957 Catholics in these 27 gaols with that of the 137 Protestant Dissenters scattered over the 42 county and city prisons in Ireland.‡ In each of these prisons there are necessarily two chaplains, one Catholic and one Church of England (and Ireland!); there

\* We believe this to be under a separate act of parliament.

† The salaries of the chaplains at Coldbath Fields Prison are not given in the return. We have supposed them to be the same as in Westminster House of Correction, viz. 600*l.* per annum, but we are informed that they are 750*l.*

‡ These figures are taken from a similar parliamentary return for Ireland as we have already quoted with respect to England.



is besides a Protestant dissenting chaplain wherever there are any Protestant dissenting prisoners. As a matter of fact, there are seventeen such chaplains, and the annual cost is 576*l.* 13*s.* 5*d.*, or about 42*l.* 1*s.* 9*d.* per head. It is always more rateably costly to provide for the instruction of small than of large numbers, but we observe by the way that one-tenth of this cost per head would amply provide for all the spiritual wants of Catholic prisoners in England.

But we must return after this long, but not we hope unimportant or useless, digression to the case of our conscientious Catholic prisoner, who, as we have found, is condemned to one week's solitary confinement over and above the punishment intended to be awarded to him. If, absenting himself from the Protestant services, he is desirous of other religious instruction, he has the opportunity once a week of asking for it. Once a week the assembled prisoners are publicly asked if any of them desire the assistance of a minister of their own "denomination or religious persuasion ;"\* and if any Catholic prisoner answers affirmatively, his name is taken down. In some of our best regulated prisons, information of this request is immediately, or as soon as can well be done, transmitted to the nearest Catholic chapel ; in fact, some governors, finding the good effect of the visits of the priest, are only too glad to get his services. In other cases, and this in large prisons too, where there are many Catholics, although few, as may well be supposed under such a system, are desirous of solitary confinement and the occasional visit of a priest, no notice is taken of the request until a certain number of such requests have accumulated. Two or three weeks sometimes elapse before the neighbouring priest hears of the request of the Catholic prisoner to see him. Before he sees him the man's firmness may well have been expended. He has been brought to acknowledge to the governor and the chaplain that he is not bigoted, and that he really likes the Protestant services very much, and, which is very likely true, that he sees no harm in them, and wonders why his priest should object to them. The fair interpretation of the act would, we have no doubt, require that when a prisoner has once requested to see a priest, the latter should have free access to him at all reasonable times, —in fact, at all such times as the Protestant chaplain has

\* This phrase has been objected to as unintelligible to an uneducated Catholic, who, it has been said, will not know his own religion to be either a "denomination" or "persuasion." In one of our large London prisons the phrase was altered, by the authority of the visiting justices, into one in which the word "Roman Catholic" was introduced. This alteration was, however, distasteful to the Protestant governors and the more bigoted of the Justice Shallows, and the form which had been objected to was reinstated.

access to prisoners in their cells. But in most cases the rule of the prison is, that for each visit there must be a special request. This is visiting-justice law, and has been held to be good on appeal to the Home Office. In some few more favourable cases greater latitude of access is, by the indulgence of the authorities, allowed to the priest; but he is in no case allowed to visit a Catholic prisoner who has not taken the unpopular and exceptional step of asking for him. He is, then, excluded from the most hardened offenders; and he is so hampered in his communications with others, and they suffer so many inconveniences and privations by following his instructions, that he has but little chance of being of much use to them.

We see, then, that the practices which have grown up under the enactments of the statute practically deprive all Catholic prisoners of the religious and moral instruction which the preamble of the act declares to be essential to discipline and reformation.

A very delicate and a somewhat difficult question here arises: Are such practices necessary deductions from the act? and if not, would other rules and a more just and liberal interpretation of the act meet the intention of the Legislature, the justice of the case, and the necessary requirements of Catholic prisoners?

In answer to this we must make at first sight a somewhat dangerous acknowledgment, viz. that there is what we believe to be a wider and better construction of the act which would greatly mend the position of those prisoners who make use of the option now offered them of absenting themselves from Protestant services, and who request the attendance of their own clergy. The rule or practice of one visit only for each request, of asking the prisoners only once a week whether they require the attendance of a clergyman of some other denomination than that of the Established Church, of putting the question in a form unintelligible to many of the prisoners, and of punishing those prisoners who absent themselves from the Protestant services with solitary confinement, is not a necessary deduction from the act, is not called for by its letter, but is rather repugnant to its whole spirit, whilst it is contrary to the declared intention of its preamble.

The danger of the admission is this: that if we show that a better state of things is obtainable under the act as it stands, we may be asked, and too many of us might be disposed, to accept possible ameliorations which after all would leave a wide, and, as we believe, an intolerable, margin of spiritual destitution outside the improvements made and, at least temporarily, accepted.



We entertain no doubt that the rule of allowing only one visit for each one request is against even the letter of the act, and that it would be in conformity with its spirit and intention to give the priest the same free access to Catholic prisoners as the Protestant chaplain has to all prisoners.

The thirty-first section says that, if any prisoner shall be of a religious persuasion differing from that of the Establishment, a minister of such persuasion shall, at the special request of the prisoner, be allowed to *visit him*, not once only for each request, but "at proper and reasonable times," and this, subject only to such restrictions as the visiting justices may impose, not for the purpose of restricting the amount of instruction or the number of the visits, but with the view of preventing the "introduction of *improper persons*," and the making of "improper communications."

Even supposing, though we cannot see how such an interpretation will at all hold water, that the rule of one visit for each one request were a necessary deduction from the words of the act, however contrary to the spirit and meaning of the preamble, it is certain that the question might be asked daily instead of weekly.

Again, as the act declares moral and religious instruction to be essential, not only to reformation, but to discipline, and yet allows prisoners to choose from what denomination they will receive such instruction, it follows reasonably, if not necessarily, that the *same amount* of this "essential" commodity shall be given to those prisoners who receive it from a Catholic priest as to those who receive it from the Protestant chaplain. And hence, it may also be argued, it also follows that, if a prisoner is excluded from Protestant daily prayers and Sunday services, he should have the benefit of the prayers and services of his own denomination, *if he can get them; i. e.* if any clergyman of his denomination will supply them. This interpretation of the statute has, we are informed, been actually adopted in some large prisons where Catholics abound.

In point of fact, we have no reasonable doubt that a construction of the law might be adopted which would reduce the grievances we should have to complain of to the following:

*First*, that Catholic prisoners, unless they make a special request to see a priest, which they are not at all likely to do, are entirely deprived of instruction in their own faith, and are unable to worship God according to the dictates of their consciences, and that thus they and the community at large are damnified; for *they* have not the same chance of reformation as other prisoners, and *the community* lose the advantage of a better discipline within the walls of the prison,

and run the imminent risk of suffering further losses from the ill conduct of the prisoner when he is discharged, and of being again chargeable with the expense of imprisoning him.

*Secondly*, that, at the best, those prisoners who desire the ministrations of a priest are not *supplied* with them, but are left to obtain them from his charity; and that if they get the necessary instruction, services, and Sacraments, this is done at the expense of people who, having already paid their county or other rate chargeable with the expenses of a prison, should not be called on to contribute further.

But there is another very great and fundamental objection to basing any hopes of amelioration on obtaining a better and fairer application of the act itself: it is that each prison is governed by its own rules, which are made by the justices, and, when approved by the Secretary of State, are binding on all parties; that the rules we complain of are now actually in force, and that to obtain any alteration or amendment it would be necessary that the justices should themselves originate them, for it is they that have the power of origination, whilst the power of the Secretary of State is confined to approval. Parliamentary enactment, and that only, can introduce uniform and beneficial arrangements amongst so many scattered, and for the most part unwilling, and often bigoted, authorities.

The Court of Queen's Bench could of course be brought to bear on them, and a *mandamus* might perhaps be got, requiring any specific justices to make rules in accordance with what might be successfully shown to be the meaning of the act. But we suppose that a separate *mandamus* must be got for each prison; and even if what we believe to be the utmost success obtainable under the provisions of the act as they stand were actually obtained, we should still require an alteration of the law to meet the two grievances which we have shown would remain.

The one only operative cure for the existing state of things is to carry out the preamble of the bill, to follow the precedents already set in the army, in the parliamentary education grant, and in the very apposite case of reformatories,—to treat Catholic and Protestant alike, and to provide Catholic chaplains for the instruction and reformation of Catholic prisoners.

The rock ahead of the movement in favour of Catholic prisoners, which, in its more public phase, was inaugurated by the great meeting which was held last year at St. James's Hall, Piccadilly, is, that those persons into whose hands the settlement with the Government of a plan of relief may fall, may rest content with amelioration short of equal dealing



with Catholic and Protestant prisoners, with Catholic and Protestant ratepayers, and with Catholic priests and Protestant clergymen, on points not affecting the endowments of the Establishment.

It is a principle capable of other application than to gaols, that the public good requires that if, for any reason, whether poverty or crime, men are sequestered, and subjected to discipline which deprives them of the power of looking after and providing for their own wants, those wants shall be supplied for them. This principle is admitted and applied with respect to bodily sustenance; it is admitted and applied with respect to the religious wants of Protestant prisoners and paupers; but it is not recognised with respect to Catholic prisoners and paupers. The first damage is borne by the unhappy individuals who are thus prejudiced, but the mischief recoils on the community.

---

#### THE NEGRO RACE AND ITS DESTINY.

BEFORE quitting the consideration of the Negro as he appears in his native seats, we have still a few words to devote to his

*Political institutions.* The orientalism which is so conspicuous a feature in all the social relations of Negroland attaches also to the type of government there exhibited. Except in Liberia, which is a democratic republic, faithfully copied from the pattern of the United States, despotic monarchy is the political form which society spontaneously assumes over the whole of Negroland. Formerly, when Mohammedan enthusiasm was fresher and fiercer, extensive kingdoms were established, which swallowed up for a time most of the minor states into which Negroland is now parcelled out. Such were the kingdoms of Melli, Songhay, and Bornu, the last-named of which has been gradually decaying ever since the sixteenth century, and cannot now muster a twentieth part of the armed force which the sultans of that age could summon around them. In the absence of standing armies, aristocracies, regular public revenues, and easy means of transit, it is scarcely possible for a large Negro state, even if once established, to continue long in being. Commanding individual genius or religious fanaticism may cement or fuse together in a temporary union a number of communities before independent; but there are disintegrating causes constantly at work which tend to reduce states so formed to such

moderate dimensions as are manageable by mediocrity and not too tempting to ambition. Among the numerous petty sovereigns of these states, whom conflicting interests dissociate, and to whom the opportunity of a good "take" of slaves by a raid into a neighbour's territory is at all times too tempting to be missed, mutual war is the normal condition of things. The state of war generates insecurity both in fact and in feeling; and insecurity precludes the improvement of agriculture, stops the development of commerce, and, generally, makes all advance in civilisation impossible. Hence it would appear that the great political desideratum for Negroland at present is the formation, under European auspices, either by raising up new chieftains or aggrandising the old, of two or three large and solidly-established kingdoms, capable of assuring to their inhabitants the blessings of internal peace.

We have now arrived at the second portion of our inquiry, that which has reference to the condition of the Negro section of the population in the various communities of European origin whither he has been transplanted. With the exception of the Mauritius, the Seychelles, Réunion, Java, and the Portuguese settlements in Africa, these communities are all found in America and the islands adjacent. The colonies of northern and Protestant nations shall first be surveyed, and afterwards those of southern and Catholic nations.

In the Danish West-Indian islands the treatment of the Negroes, though formerly inhuman, was gradually ameliorated by home legislation, until in 1848 all the slaves were emancipated. The Danish missionaries have laboured actively during a long series of years, so that at the present time nearly the entire Negro population of their colonies professes Lutheranism.

In the Dutch colonies (Guiana, Curaçao, and one or two other small islands) the condition of the Negroes up to the end of the last century was one of great hardship. Many cases of revolting cruelty on the part of masters are on record. The mortality among the slaves was very great. But ever since the beginning of the present century milder treatment has been encouraged by the government, and partially enforced by the laws. In 1851 a code of regulations as to the diet, clothing, lodging, protection, and punishment of the slaves came into operation, the provisions of which are so humane, that if enforced they leave little to be desired. No provision, however, is mentioned, giving facilities for manumission. Dr. Waitz pertinently asks, "Is it the moral im-



provement of the Negroes or of the Dutch which has rendered this milder legislation possible? Or is it the English emancipation, and the fear of risings among the slaves, which extort humanity from the masters? and how much of these legal provisions is really executed, how much evaded?"

The condition of the Negroes in England's colonial possessions has ranged, during the three centuries which have elapsed since she first entered the African slave-market, between the extremes of an iron hopeless bondage and of a lazy *dolce-far-niente* independence. And in truth, the pendulum has seldom stopped, scarcely even lingered, at any intermediate stage; the Negroes have been either overtasked and ill-used drudges, or chartered libertines; and in the West Indies they have found either a house of bondage or a land of Cockayne. Dr. Waitz, on the authority of Sir James Stephen, asserts (p. 285) that "the state of the slaves in the English West Indies was essentially worse than that of the slaves in the colonies of other nations, of the slaves in the ancient world, and among the Germanic peoples in the middle ages." It is needless to repeat a thrice-told tale of stripes, tortures, and blood-hounds; more especially as, however such stories may be multiplied and authenticated, the difficulty remains of determining the *proportion* which the cases of cruel bear to those of humane treatment in the colonies where they occur, and to similar acts of barbarity in the colonies of other nations. It is enough to consider that one circumstance, the presence of which more than any other relieves, while its absence peculiarly aggravates, the bitterness of slavery, namely, the possibility to the slave of obtaining freedom. Is his lot hopeless? is he debarred from the prospect of a brighter future? In this respect the law and practice in our colonies were both detestable. "Emancipation was impeded by onerous imposts, which yet in the course of the eighteenth century were generally raised; the slaves could not buy their own freedom." Consequently the freed negroes were few in number in the first instance, while the restrictions on their freedom were iniquitous and degrading. "The courts of law interpreted the act of manumission by the owner as nothing more than an abandonment or release of his own proper authority over the person of the slave, which did not, and could not, convey to the object of his bounty the civil and political rights of a natural-born subject."\* In explanation of this general assertion, the writer states that the evidence of no free coloured person was received in criminal cases against a white; that no such

\* See Bryan Edwards' *History of the West Indies*, vol. ii. p. 18.

person could hold the most insignificant office of public trust, even that of a constable; nor vote at any election, nor inherit property above the amount of 2000*l*. Further, the marriages of slaves had no legal efficacy, and no sort of connection was recognised between them and the land they cultivated. "After labouring for a few years," says Bryan Edwards, "a good Negro gets comfortably established, has built himself a house, obtained a wife, and begins to see a young family rising about him. His provision-ground, the creation of his own industry, and the staff of his existence, affords him not only support, but the means even of adding something to the mere necessities of life. In this situation, he is seized on by the sheriff's officer, forcibly separated from his wife and children, dragged to public auction, purchased by a stranger, and perhaps sent to terminate his miserable existence in the mines of Mexico." The writer adds that this is no rare case, like instances of alleged extraordinary cruelty; "unhappily it occurs every day, and under the present system will continue to occur."

At the time that Bryan Edwards wrote (1792), the philanthropic party in England had begun to agitate for the abolition of the slave-trade, and were presenting petitions to Parliament with that end in view. Edwards, a humane man, and well acquainted from personal observation with the state and wants of the colonies, was strongly opposed to immediate abolition. He pointed out that, from various causes,—of which the principal were the disproportion between males and females in the whole number of imported Negroes, the practice of polygamy among the slaves in the colonies themselves, and the general degradation of their condition,—the slave population, far from keeping up or adding to its numbers by natural increase, required to be constantly recruited by fresh importations from Africa, in order to keep pace in any degree with the demands of the labour-market; that the plantations were even then under-stocked; and that to cut off the only source of labour open to the planters, was to consign them to certain ruin. He added, what was undoubtedly true, that many of the soul-moving pictures drawn by the abolitionists were absurdly overcharged, since three-fourths of the Negroes conveyed in the slavers were already in a condition of slavery in Africa, and a very large proportion had been slaves from birth. But when he stated that they exchanged a harsher for a milder form of slavery, although doubtless he believed it to be so, he made an assertion which, as we have already seen, was contrary to fact.

The whole question was placed upon its only right basis



by the clearest and most capacious intellect then existing in the British islands—by Edmund Burke. That great man, in his *Sketch of a Negro Code*, sent with a letter to Secretary Dundas, in 1792, while he embodied all the provisions which the experience of all ages and nations has shown to be the most effectual, both for mitigating the evils of slavery while it exists, and for gradually extinguishing it in the ratio of the progressive culture of the slave, avoided all those sweeping measures, ruinous to the master and morally injurious to the slave, into which an exaggerated sentimentality was hurrying the philanthropists. He proposed, firstly, that various measures should be adopted with the view of regulating the trade in Negroes; such as restrictions on the class of Negroes selected at the marts, on the number per ton conveyed in each slaver, and on the dietary, &c. during the voyage. Secondly, that after their arrival in the colonies their condition should, so far as possible, be permanently elevated by imperial enactments, establishing Negro-protectors in every district, giving to the slave the right to buy his freedom at a fair valuation, encouraging and recognising their marriages, forbidding the separation of families, and so attaching them to the soil, like the *adscripti glebæ* of antiquity, or the serfs of modern Russia, that they could not be sold off the plantations on which they were born without their own consent. Substantially, it was the slave-code of Spain and Portugal which Mr. Burke desired to induce the British Parliament and people to accept. Of that code the spirit, principles, and salient features were due to the influence of the Catholic Church, and are precisely those which, without social convulsion, and with the least possible injury, moral or material, to individuals, succeeded in gradually extinguishing slavery in Europe. Under that code slavery is either extinct or is fast dying out in South America, and is in continual process of extinction in Cuba; although there, as we shall presently show, the interference of the civil law, and the continued importation of slaves from Africa, tend to retard and qualify the natural elevating effects of the code.

But one of the evils of that system of party government which necessarily prevails in a constitutional country, is that it is far more difficult to carry a wise measure than a brilliant one, to legislate conformably to permanent reason rather than at the dictate of some temporary interest. A paternal government, if but moderately enlightened, will generally legislate in the best and most rational manner to meet any given exigency, because it knows that the most effectual way of keeping the subjects satisfied with things as they are,

is to make all social arrangements so rational and equitable as to leave them no ground of serious complaint; whereas a government which represents a party consults primarily the interest of that party, and is generally contented if it can legislate so as to secure popularity, or at least avoid raising an outcry. It thus happened that between the two opposing parties Burke's proposal fell to the ground. The West-Indian party, too confident in their present strength, rejected it because it interfered in favour of the Negro too much; the Abolitionists, because it interfered too little. The Government, counting votes, not reasons, did nothing as long as the planters could command a majority in Parliament, and gave up every thing as soon as the Abolitionists succeeded, through the fierce excitement which they stirred up in the country, in bringing round that majority to their side.

In 1807 the slave-trade was abolished, and in 1811 made punishable by transportation. The planters had made good use of their time while the struggle was pending; for whereas the total number of slaves in the West Indies in 1792 is estimated by Bryan Edwards at about 430,000, the total number at the date of emancipation (1834) was about 720,000, a number which\* was certainly *less* than the aggregate of the slave population in 1811. Yet no sooner was the trade abolished than the economical difficulties predicted by Bryan Edwards made their appearance. Even while it lasted the plantations, from the causes already stated, were under-stocked; and after it had ceased the pressure grew annually more severe. Owing chiefly to the inequality of the sexes, the Negro population in most of the islands, being now unrecruited from abroad, gradually declined in number, and the decline brought with it stationary or diminished production, together with increased toil and hardship to the slave. For it is easy to see that, if the work of a plantation could be just kept under, without over-driving, by one hundred Negroes, the reduction of that number to ninety must result either in a diminution of production to the extent of ten per cent, or in the exaction, by cruelty and "driving," of the same amount of work from a diminished number of hands. The only way of providing against the decrease of the labouring population,—apart from the questionable expedient, always of doubtful efficacy, of importing free coolie or Chinese labour,—would have been for those islands in which the sexes were most equally distributed to devote themselves to rearing slaves for sale in the other islands; just as Virginia and Maryland breed Negroes for exportation to Alabama or Tennessee. Probably some-

\* See *Ed. Rev.* for April 1859.



thing of the kind was attempted; if so, the attempt was quashed by the Act of 1823, prohibiting the inter-colonial slave-trade. Such a trade, if allowed at all, should certainly have been placed under most stringent regulations. Yet it seems both inconsistent and oppressive, in a legislature which at the very time permitted the unrestricted sale of Negroes in the *home-market* of each colony,—which allowed of the separation of families, and denied to the slave the right of purchasing himself free,—to prohibit, on the plea of *humanity*, a series of operations of which the result would have been, by increasing the supply of labour, to make more easy the position of the labourers. Encumbered by mortgages and charges of various kinds, under which it could barely bring a profit to the owner even in prosperous times, West-Indian property, now that an adequate supply of labour was no longer obtainable, gradually deteriorated and became a source of anxiety, if not loss, to its possessors. Emancipation, therefore, in 1834, did but put the planters out of their pain at once; it was the finishing stroke to a process of gradual impoverishment which had been going on for years.

“This English Negro-emancipation,” observes Dr. Waitz, “will remain to all time as one of the most stupendous moral, economical, and political follies which the history of human culture has to point to. A multitude of thoroughly uncultivated men, torn from their native country, compelled by the lash to work only for others, whose intelligence had been purposely repressed, ill-used in various ways, and habituated to every species of vice, particularly to sloth,—is suddenly released from its servitude in order, for the future, to behave as a nation of mature self-governing men. If, during several generations, the laws had secured to them two free days in the week on which to labour for their own benefit, and had given them the right and the opportunity of buying themselves free, then at least a large proportion of them would have become fond of labour. Had they been kindly treated, or, at any rate, not trampled upon; had efforts been made to develop their intelligence by education, and their moral sense by religion; had they been placed in such a position that their own interest might appear to go hand in hand with that of their masters, or not to run wholly counter to it,—then this great measure might at least have been acquitted from the reproach of utter irrationality.”

Concerning the condition of the Negroes since emancipation, the accounts vary greatly. The anti-slavery party, in their exultation that the Negro can no longer be whipped, however idle he may be, are too ready to wink at the frailties of their *protégé*, and to believe that he is making rapid

strides in civilisation. On the other hand, the economists, as well as the sterner moralists, are perhaps too prone to regard the experiment as a total failure. The truth seems to be that, though the cost of the experiment was needlessly extravagant, both morally and materially; though the economical structure of West Indian society has been subverted past renewal, and an entire generation of Negroes has been rendered good for nothing by the gift of a liberty for which they were not prepared,—yet the natural good effects of freedom are at last beginning to show themselves. In the first place, the Negro population, which before emancipation was decreasing, has since that time been steadily on the increase;\* and the “beautiful black peasantry,” whose licensed laziness moved the spleen of Mr. Carlyle, have, it would appear, even in the larger islands,—partly from the increasing population, which begins to press upon the means of subsistence, partly from their having acquired a taste for European clothing and other luxuries,—shown of late some inclination to go to work again. In Barbadoes, indeed, and others of the smaller islands, the density of the population is such as to compel the Negro to work hard for wages. In Jamaica the chief result of emancipation has been, that the planters, finding that the land could no longer be cultivated, have taken to selling it. Within eight years after emancipation, 100,000 acres of land had been purchased in fee by Negroes; and as the process has since gone on, probably in an increased ratio, there seems reason to believe that the greater part of the soil of the island, which does not amount to 3,000,000 acres altogether, will pass before many years into the hands of black or coloured proprietors. A large number of these peasant proprietors, according to the report of a Jamaica magistrate in 1853, owned horses, pigs, and poultry, and drove a brisk trade in their farm-produce. In 1850 Bigelow found ten or twelve coloured members in the Jamaica House of Assembly, and noticed that the old prejudice against African blood was fast disappearing.

*United States.*—The condition of the Negroes in the United States, as to which so many conflicting statements perplex the world, can here be only described in general terms. In the fifteen slave-holding states of the Union there are nearly four millions of slaves. Each state being independent and sovereign in its internal affairs, the slave-codes of the different States present certain variations; but the com-

\* See Edin. Rev. *ubi supra*.



mon interest which binds them all together is so strong that in the main American slavery wears a uniform aspect. The general rule is, that the manumission of slaves is systematically discouraged. Whereas in Cuba one Negro in every four is free, in the American slave-states the proportion of free blacks is only as one in nine. Nowhere has the Negro the legal right to buy himself free. In some states, as South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi, free Negroes are considered "offensive,"\* and are not permitted to emigrate to or remain in the state. A master in any one of those states who emancipates a slave is punished by a heavy fine, and the slave is sold by public auction for the benefit of the state. It is illegal also to teach a slave to read and write; any person attempting it is subject to a fine of thirty dollars for each offence. Nowhere does the law place the smallest restriction on the separation of families at sales. We might say much more, and after having described the law, might illustrate its working by examples; but the reader who has followed us thus far will be perfectly able to draw the necessary conclusions for himself. He will see that with such laws, however kindly and indulgently the slaves may be treated on many plantations, their condition is approximated to that of animals rather than to that of men. For the first time in the world, a system of slavery has been organised on a large scale which cuts off from the slave all hope of raising himself to freedom. For the first time it has been gravely avowed, to quote the words of an American judge,† that "the end of slavery is the profit of the master, his security, and the public safety;" and that "the slave, to remain a slave,‡ must be made sensible that there is no appeal from his master; that the master's power is in no instance usurped, but is conferred by the law of man at least, if not by the law of God." We cannot wonder, such being their laws, that American writers have invented a physiological theory to justify them, and have charged the Negro with a radical incapacity and irrationality, disqualifying them permanently for freedom; a charge of which Dr. Waitz's treatise, from the first page to the last, forms one continued refutation.

It may be asked, how do the slaves fare in those states which, from being colonies of Catholic nations, have become

\* Slavery in the United States. Longmans, 1856. † Ibid. p. 54.

‡ This assertion, by the way, is palpably false; for both among many African nations and in Catholic communities, the power of the master over the slave is restricted in many ways, yet the slave remains to all intents and purposes a slave.

incorporated in the American Union, viz. Louisiana and Florida? With regard to Florida, we have no precise information. In Louisiana, according to the unimpeachable testimony of Mr. Olmsted, the condition of the slaves is much better than in Virginia, and *a fortiori* than in the Carolinas or Alabama. He was informed\* by a Virginian slave-holder, that in Louisiana the slaves were more intelligent and treated with more familiarity by the whites than in Virginia; that in consequence there was more amalgamation between the races; besides, he added, "the laws in Louisiana were much more favourable to them." Afterwards, upon visiting Louisiana, Mr. Olmsted found that some miles above New Orleans there was a large number of free coloured planters settled along both banks of the river, who, being descended from French or Spanish masters and Negro women, had, by the old laws of the country, as they stood before annexation to the Union, inherited the condition of free men. He noticed also, apparently to his great astonishment, that in the cathedral at New Orleans, the white and black worshipers mingled together indiscriminately and knelt to pray side by side.

The condition of the Negro in the colonies founded by Catholic nations must now be examined. After noticing in order the present colonial possessions of France, Spain, and Portugal, we shall turn our attention to the communities, now independent, which were originally founded by those nations respectively.

*French Colonies.*—Negroes were first introduced into the French Antilles in the sixteenth century. In Guadaloupe, the largest of the islands, there were in 1841, out of an aggregate population of 131,162 persons, 93,558 slaves against 37,604 whites and free people of colour. The famous *Code Noir*, first promulgated under Louis XIV. in 1683, while it contained many humane provisions relating to the food, clothing, and instruction of the slaves, and distinctly forbade the separation of families at sales, precluded them, on the other hand, from the right of holding any private property, or of giving valid testimony in a court of law, and condemned the offspring of a white and a female slave always to follow the condition of the mother. There seems reason to believe† that the humanity of these regulations remained to a great extent in the state of theory and benevolent intention, and that the lot of the slaves under French masters, although better on the whole than in the English colonies,

\* Olmsted's *Slave States*, p. 108.

† Waitz, p. 294.



was generally a hard one. Of late years, the treatment is said to have become extremely mild: the slaves were allowed to accumulate private property;\* were attached to the soil which they cultivated, so that they could not be sold off their own plantations; and could not be compelled to work more than a stated number of hours. In consequence, it would seem, of these preparative measures, emancipation, which came in 1848, had not the disturbing effects which attended it in the English colonies. After a brief crisis, the slaves quietly went to work as free labourers for wages, and the production of sugar has not fallen off, has even in some islands been increased.

*Spanish Colonies.*—Cuba and Porto Rico, the remnants of the once magnificent dominion of Spain in the New World, are in themselves possessions of no contemptible value. The material progress of Cuba in the last thirty years has been very great. An English traveller,† writing in 1850, comments on the remarkable contrast which the state of Jamaica in that year presented to that of Cuba, the one all languor and decay, the other all industry and vitality. The population, according to the most probable estimate,‡ amounted in 1859 to about 1,500,000 souls, of whom 700,000 were whites, 200,000 free black and coloured persons, and 600,000 slaves. The old Spanish laws, so admirably mild and wise, are still in force; but their power for good has been latterly abridged, in proportion as the dignity and social weight of the Church, which, as in Spain, has been stripped of nearly the whole of its property, have declined. Among the provisions designed for the protection and benefit of the slaves while in slavery, the following are the chief:—Slaves married by the Church cannot be separated against their will. On Sundays and holidays the slave is entitled to his full time for his own benefit, with the exception of two hours for necessary labour on the plantations. No master is allowed to inflict upon his sole authority a punishment exceeding twenty-five lashes. Again, the law decisively favours emancipation. Every slave has a right to go to a magistrate and get himself valued, and on paying his valuation to receive his free papers. He is allowed to pay the amount by instalments. He can also compel his owner to transfer him to another master at the price at which he has been valued. Many slaves are skilled in some trade or handicraft; a circumstance which of course

\* Waitz, p. 295.

† Hill's Peru and Mexico, 1860.

‡ Dana's To Cuba and back, 1859.

greatly enhances their value to a master; but the law permits no addition to be made to their valuation on this account beyond the sum of one hundred dollars. A slave-mother may enfranchise her infant at the font by the payment of twenty-five dollars. Lastly, the Negro, after he has won his freedom, does not, as in the southern states of the Union, find himself a member of a degraded class, nor under the ban of a rigorous social exclusion. On the contrary,\* in all civil privileges and before the law, the free black is the equal of the white; and his social position is "quite as good as in New England, if not better."

On the other hand, the excellent law which orders that every slave be baptised, religiously brought up, instructed in the Christian doctrine, and receive Christian burial, if it was ever executed at all, has at least in later times fallen into desuetude. The slaves are all baptised, and all receive Christian burial; but between the cradle and the grave little care is said to be taken of their Christian education. In the towns the state of things is somewhat better; but very few of the slaves on the plantations (we still quote Mr. Dana) attend Mass or receive any religious instruction whatever. Again, the present civil law of Cuba† contains the iniquitous enactment, that no marriage shall be valid between a white and a person having any tinge of black blood. There is in consequence a vast amount of concubinage. Such a life the Church of course will not sanction, but requires the parties either to marry or to separate. Marriage, however, being interdicted by the local law, separation is practically the only course open; and it is easy to understand that few can so rise above human frailty as to make up their minds to this; hence they keep aloof from the Church and the Sacraments. Lastly, through the want of Christian instruction, the Negro, the sensual bent of whose nature we have already commented upon, is impatient of the restrictions of Christian marriage, and actually prefers in most cases a mock union performed by the master to a marriage solemnised by the Church.

It is well known that for some years back a large number of slaves has been annually imported into Cuba from Africa. Taylor, an authority already quoted,‡ declares that a marvellous improvement takes place in the appearance and manner of these Africans after a brief sojourn in Cuba. Speaking of some Negroes whom he had seen landed from a slaver, and who were then so wild, filthy, and unintelligent as to seem scarcely human, he asserts that the steady rule of a kind

\* Dana, p. 218.    † Ibid. p. 214.    ‡ See *Rambler*, part viii. p. 179.



master so changed them for the better, that after an interval of two years they were hardly recognisable. The comparison, however, would have been more valuable had it been instituted between the Cuban slave and the African *before*, instead of *after*, the middle passage.

Of the state of the Negroes in Porto Rico, Dr. Waitz gives us no detailed information, merely saying that the slaves form but one-ninth of the population. By returns made in 1836, the white population was estimated at about 188,000, the free people of colour at 131,000, and the slaves at 41,000; total, 360,000.\* These proportions strikingly show how infallibly the Spanish laws tend to extinguish slavery, in the absence of continued importation. It would appear that during a long series of years no slaves have been imported into Porto Rico. But if a newspaper-paragraph which we lately noticed can be relied upon, a fresh importation has recently been commenced, *viâ* Cuba.

*Portuguese Colonies.*—The colonial possessions of Portugal, confined at the present day with trifling exceptions to Africa, are to be regarded rather as commercial stations than as colonies, since the climate is too oppressive even for the Portuguese constitution to thrive and multiply in. The number of slaves and of coloured people is insignificant, because the number of resident whites has always been so. Several tribes in the neighbourhood of the Congo River and around St. Paul de Loanda have been converted by Portuguese missionaries; but of late years the zeal for propagating the faith would appear to have languished. Yet the Portuguese influence, as is evident from the testimony of Dr. Livingstone, has penetrated deeply and efficaciously into the interior; and if another sovereign like John III., other governors like Albuquerque, other priests like Simon Vaz, were to be again given to Portugal, the conversion and civilisation of the whole native race of austro-central Africa, which, though not of the pure Negro type, is closely akin to it, may be not unreasonably hoped for.

*Hayti.*—This fine island was formerly divided between the French and Spaniards. But the effects of the French Revolution extended from the mother-country to the colony, and after a bloody war of races, the whole island achieved its independence. This result was in great part attributable to the genius of the black hero Toussaint l'Ouverture. After his treacherous capture and removal to France, the state of the island grew from bad to worse. It enjoyed, indeed, a few

\* Gazetteer of the World; Edinburgh, 1859.

years of good government (1822-1843) under President Boyer; but subsequently the old feud between Negroes and Mulattoes has been revived, and intestine warfare has become chronic. The Emperor Faustin Soulouque, a pure black, persecuted the coloured races with the greatest barbarity; but about two years ago he was driven into exile, and we have seen no accounts of the subsequent course of events. No white man is allowed to possess land in Hayti, or to enjoy the rights of citizenship. Christianity exists but in name, and the people have lapsed into their old belief in sorcery and witchcraft. The population is believed to be about one million. On the whole, the present condition of Hayti is a telling argument against the capacity of the Negro race to preserve and develop a social order without extraneous aid.

*Spanish America.*—According to the best computation which we can form from the materials at our disposal, the Negro population scattered over the independent states formed out of the old continental possessions of Spain in North and South America,—viz. Mexico, Central America, New Granada, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Chili, La Plata, Paraguay, and Venezuela,—amounts to about 700,000 souls. Of these probably at least two-thirds are free, and the remainder are continually passing into freedom by operation of law. The following are among the testimonies which we have collected upon the condition of the Negro race in these beautiful countries. Our authority, where no other is stated, is the excellent *Gazetteer of the World* above referred to. In Central America the Negroes are all free, slavery having been declared illegal by an act of the federal government shortly after the separation from Spain. In Peru the constitution declares that all persons born in the republic subsequently to its passing are free, and that Negroes imported as slaves at once acquire their freedom. Of the 4000 slaves in Lima, Mr. Hill, in the work already quoted, says that “they are becoming by the law gradually free: they are commonly permitted to work for themselves several hours during the day, so that the industrious often save enough to buy their freedom; the amount, if the parties do not agree, being fixed by judges appointed by the law.” In Chili the Negroes “are treated with a degree of tenderness and humanity that greatly alleviates their servitude. A law has been passed declaring that no slave can henceforth be born in Chili, so that slavery may be regarded as virtually abolished in this fine country.” In La Plata there are found among the Mulattoes “professors and teachers of the liberal arts.” “The Negroes . . . are



treated with kindness and attention when sick, and never abandoned in old age. They are even said to be better fed and better dressed than the poorer classes of the whites; and many of them obtain their freedom after a short period of service." From Paraguay we have similar accounts. In Venezuela the slaves were all emancipated in 1854.

Brazil, once the humble satellite of Portugal, but now a mighty orb, in comparison with whose lustre the parent luminary is destined before long to "pale its ineffectual fire," seems to be in many respects the very Paradise of the Negro race. The slave-trade was effectually abolished by the imperial government in 1850, since which time the demands of the labour-market have been adequately kept under by immigration from Europe. Isolated instances of cruelty are still too common; but the law places freedom so completely within the Negro's reach, and treats him, when he has become free, with such absolute equity, that his condition on the whole is one eminently hopeful and cheering. Out of a population of 7,000,000, it is estimated that about 3,000,000 are slaves, and more than 2,000,000 free blacks or Mulattoes. In Southey's *History of Brazil* (vol. iii.) a detailed account may be found of the state of the Brazilian slaves some seventy years ago, particularly of those on the monastic estates. The same provisions respecting the slave's right of purchasing his freedom at a fixed valuation, manumission at the font, &c., which we have already met with in describing the Spanish code, were also enforced in Brazil by the laws of Portugal. Since the separation from the mother-country, the local legislature, to its eternal honour,—how far unlike the United States government!—has adopted in the fullest extent the same humane and Christian policy. Kidder, an American Bible-distributor, who visited Brazil in 1857, writes as follows: "In Brazil every thing is in favour of freedom, and such are the facilities for the slave to emancipate himself, and when emancipated, if he possess the proper qualifications, to ascend to higher eminences than those of a mere free black, that *fruit* will be written against slavery in this empire before another century rolls round. Some of the most intelligent and best educated men I met in Brazil were of African descent. With freedom and merit, no matter how black a man's skin, no place in society is refused him." Compare with this state of things the slave-system of Georgia or Alabama, under which free Negroes are deemed "offensive," and hunted out of the state!

The Negroes on the monastic estates in the province of

Pernambuco were never sold, never chastised with the whip. The sexes were equalised. They were required to work by the piece, and could easily finish the task assigned to them by three o'clock in the afternoon; the rest of the day was their own. Early marriages among the slaves were encouraged, and the children carefully instructed by the monks. A notion prevailed among them that they were in the service of St. Benedict himself, rather than in that of his living representatives. Our Lady of the Rosary (*Nuestra Senhora do Rosario*) was the special patroness of the Negroes in Brazil, and she was sometimes painted as a Negress.

We have now, with the aid of Dr. Waitz, completed the sketch which we proposed to give of the Negro race, both in its native and its adopted seats. A rough estimate of the entire Negro population all over the world gives the following result :

	Free.	Slaves.	Total.
Africa . . . . .	13,000,000	39,000,000	52,000,000
British Colonies . .	957,000	. .	957,000
Danish ditto . . . .	33,000	. .	33,000
Dutch ditto . . . .	3,000	72,000	75,000
United States . . . .	400,000	3,200,000	3,600,000
French Colonies . .	318,000	. .	318,000
Spanish ditto . . . .	250,000	640,000	890,000
Hayti . . . . .	1,000,000	. .	1,000,000
Spanish America . .	615,000	205,000	820,000
Brazil . . . . .	2,000,000	3,000,000	5,000,000
Total . . . . .	18,576,000	46,117,000	64,693,000

Comparing the civil condition of the Negro in Protestant and Catholic communities, we arrive at the following result, Hayti being excluded from the calculation :

	Free.	Bond.	Proportion of free to bond.
Catholic Communities	3,183,000	3,845,000	1 to 1·208
Protestant Communities	1,393,000	3,272,000	1 to 2·35

That is, whereas in Catholic communities the number of free Negroes is nearly equal to the number of slaves, in Protestant



communities the slaves are more than two to one. Now it must be remembered that the Catholic Church does not pretend, like the Abolitionists of America and the pietists of Exeter Hall, to stigmatise the holding of one man in servitude by another as under all circumstances a sin. Yet it appears that in practice the Catholic system is more favourable to Negro freedom than the Protestant, very nearly in the ratio of two to one. Moreover, this proportion increases every year; for in Spanish America and Brazil slavery has a constant tendency to become extinct, while in the United States it has no such tendency.

We are now in a position to give some answer to the questions which were placed at the head of the first part of this article. To the question, Whence comes it that the Negro race is so easily enslaved? we may answer, that the principal cause is in the Negro himself. He is deficient in forethought, deficient also in after-thought; he neither takes precautions beforehand against the machinations which have his enslavement for their object, nor, after they have succeeded, and he is become a slave, does brooding reflection upon the evils of his condition distress his mind, and fill it with the desire of vengeance. Easily diverted, like a child, by external passing shows from the indulgence of inward feeling, he soon, if only he be well fed and allowed to amuse himself in his *play-hours* after his own fashion, becomes reconciled to a thralldom of which the iron would enter into and eat away a white man's soul. This, however, of itself would not account for the eagerness which the superior races have always shown to take Negroes for slaves in preference to the people of other inferior races. The ease with which he can be enslaved would signify little were his value as a labourer inconsiderable. But, on the contrary, his healthy constitution and robust frame enable him to accomplish in tropical climates, with cheerfulness and gaiety, an amount of hard work which would kill a white man, and greatly overtax the powers of a Hindoo. There are large districts of the world—such as the delta and lower valley of the Mississippi, the Antilles, and the southern slave-states of the Union—of which the productiveness could never have been fully developed without forced Negro-labour; and there are other large districts, such as the great basin of the Amazon and its tributaries, now lying in a state of nature and almost useless to man, of which it is difficult to conceive how the *exploitation* can ever be effected without the aid of the docile strong-limbed Negro race.

Must we, however, maintain with the Abolitionists, that, easy as it may be to reduce the Negro to slavery, the act is, and always has been, a crime against human nature and the Divine law? We cannot think so. The natural laziness and sensuality of the race would prevent the power of labour which is in it from ever being called forth, were they left to themselves; and to enslave the Negro, provided it be done under equitable conditions, which leave open to him the door of freedom as the reward of self-control, is in fact to place him under a course of training, which teaches and compels him to play that part in the world for which God and nature have evidently designed him. The case may be compared in many respects with that of the assignment of convicts as servants, a practice which went on for several years in our penal colonies. The condition of the assigned servant had about it many of the incidents of slavery: his master was bound to feed and clothe him, but paid him no wages; he could set him to any work he chose; and in case of his turning refractory, could get him flogged by order of the nearest magistrate. Yet we have no hesitation in saying,—and we speak from a considerable colonial experience,—that the moral operation of the assignment system in reforming and elevating the convicts submitted to it, was far more unmistakably beneficial than that of any of the many penal systems which have since been tried in its place.

We believe, then, that as a state of discipline and probation,—as a stage in its progress towards a higher level of culture,—slavery, under equitable conditions, is desirable for a large portion of the Negro race. For the animating principle of these conditions we cannot look elsewhere than to the Catholic Church, the supreme authority in moral and spiritual things on earth. It is not safe to leave the Negro to the unchecked control of individual owners; nor can statesmanship, even though it may frame just rules, be depended upon to provide adequately for their due execution. As the loving spirit of the spouse of Christ must dictate the conditions under which slavery may lawfully exist, so the watchfulness of her pastors is the only efficient check which can insure those conditions being faithfully observed. To enforce their observance upon all necessary occasions is the duty of the Christian state.

To give, then, a final as well as a formal cause for the phenomenon under consideration, the Negro is easily enslaved, because—provided always the society into which he is brought be Catholic—it is for his own good that he should



be so. Received under the sheltering ægis of the Church, whose establishment and free working, wherever they are permitted, are the reign of justice, truth, and charity on earth, the Negro feels himself, though called to be a bondman, yet "the freeman of the Lord;"\* and finds in the circumstances of his state that exterior support, that constant inner stimulus, to his moral being, without which he can seldom prevent himself from falling into the slough of indolence and sensuality natural to his race. He finds too that he need not give up the hope of raising himself even in this world, since his servitude is of a kind which looks *upwards*, and which it rests with himself, through his own persevering self-mastery, to exchange for freedom. But in a country where the authority of the Church over the conscience of the individual is disowned, it must be admitted that the Negro cannot safely be held in slavery. In such a country, as for example in the United States, either no check at all or no effectual check can be placed on the tyrannous and covetous propensities of masters; and slavery becomes in consequence, for the majority of the slaves, a brutalising and accursed state of life. In Protestant countries, therefore, good men feel by a true instinct that it is right to aim at a total abolition of slavery. For experience shows that the different Protestant sects can exercise no regulating moral influence antagonistic to the temporal interests of their lay members; and the Catholic Church—the only power which ever has, and ever will, "bear up against the world"—is by the nature of the case debarred from her rightful office of authoritative admonition, and has no determining voice in social arrangements.

To the second question, therefore, What is the nature of the prospect of a change for the better in the general condition of the race? we answer, that he who understands and would promote their true interests, will not be misled by the cry of Emancipation, but will steadily look to the introduction among these teeming millions of the faith and spirit of the Catholic Church, as to the only hope of permanent improvement, whether for the race or for individuals, and whether slavery be abolished or retained. And, as the ordinary human means by which this must be effected, he will look forward to the purification and extension of the influence of Catholic states throughout the countries occupied by the Negro.

Lastly, to the question, What is the ideal social state to be desired for the race? we should answer, Progressive

\* 1 Cor. vii 22.

training for the duties of freemen and the works of civilisation under the tutelage of superior races, being Catholic. In America the condition of freedom and that of slavery are alike compatible with the attainment of this end. Where some special circumstance, such as density of population causing a pressure on the means of subsistence, supplies the Negro with that external stimulus to industry which he requires, there, though he still needs the direction of the white man's more developed reason, it is neither necessary nor desirable that he should be enslaved. But in the absence of such circumstances, it is to be hoped that Catholic nations will not be deterred by the diatribes of the press, nor by the spurious thunder of Exeter Hall, from setting the Negro to work in that condition of regulated servitude without which, as a general rule, no work can be got out of him. Brazil will probably find it necessary to go again to Africa for labour, when she seriously takes in hand the settlement of the valley of the Amazon; and her doing so, provided she observe all the precautions which religion and humanity require, will be justifiable even upon the Benthamite maxim, that we should look to "the greatest good of the greatest number."

Upon the Negroes in Africa European influence must be exerted in two ways, in the sphere of morals and in the sphere of politics. Those who have studied the history of the conversion of nations, know how closely these two provinces of human action are related. While Portugal flourished and enlarged her dominion in the East, Christianity also made signal conquests; and but for the collapse of her power, Japan would not have lost the faith, nor Goa, once the centre of enlightenment and the holy city of the Indies, become a mournful heap of ruins and sepulchres. At the present day, France, in spite of infidelity and revolution, is the great missionary nation of the world. The French Church sends out into every land the heralds of the Gospel; and the French state, though not, alas, identifying herself with the faith which they preach, yet, regarding them as its citizens, sustains them energetically, and will not suffer their blood to be shed with impunity. France has already a firm hold upon Africa, and the best hope for the Negro race is that her ascendancy there may become yet more decisive. Already she is contemplating commercial treaties with the Tuaricks, the Berber inhabitants of the Great Desert; and the day is not far distant when French caravans from Algeria will be seen in the markets of Kano and Timbuktu. In the upper



valley of the Senegal her influence is steadily making way. In Abyssinia and the upper valley of the Nile, her missionaries and those of Austria are making many converts; and it seems not extravagant to hope that, through their influence, joined to the impression made by the exhibition of her power in chastising the infidels in Syria, the schismatic church of Abyssinia may be reattached ere long to the centre of Catholic unity. From east, west, and north, the paganism and brutality of Negroland are threatened with invasion. By encouraging the formation of large and powerful native kingdoms, Christian states may hope to put a stop to that interminable strife and confusion which now exist, and which make all advance in civilisation impossible; and by sending in the ministers of Christ, European and native, the Christian Church may hope gradually to raise the Negro race out of the depths of impurity and superstition in which they are plunged. When nations are found able and willing to do their duty, we may hope that the Lord of the harvest will send in fitting labourers. New Xaviers, new Clavers, will one day arise, to carry through central Africa the torch of faith:

“Alter erit tum Tiphys, et altera quæ vehat Argo  
Delectos heroas.”

The lost Churches of Asia, those missing gems in the crown of the mighty Mother, will be replaced by new Churches in Africa, and in the fullness of time the primæval curse will be taken off from the sons of Ham.

---

## Communicated Articles.

### THE ANCIENT SAINTS.

#### CHAPTER V.

##### ST. CHRYSOSTOM.—THE DEATH.

WHENCE is this devotion to St. John Chrysostom, which leads me to dwell upon the thought of him, and makes me kindle at his name, when so many other great saints, as the year brings round their festivals, command indeed my veneration, but exert no personal claim upon my heart? Many holy men have died in exile, many holy men have been successful preachers; and what more can we write upon St. Chrysostom's monument than this, that he was eloquent and that he suffered persecution? He is not an Athanasius, expounding a sacred dogma with a luminousness which is almost an inspiration; nor is he Athanasius, again, in his romantic life-long adventures, in his sublime solitariness, in his ascendancy over all classes of men, in his series of triumphs over material force and civil tyranny. Nor, except by the contrast, does he remind us of that Ambrose who kept his ground obstinately in an imperial city, and fortified himself against the heresy of a court by the living rampart of a devoted population. Nor is he Gregory or Basil, rich in the literature and philosophy of Greece, and embellishing the Church with the spoils of heathenism. Again, he is not an Augustine, devoting long years to one masterpiece of thought, and laying, in successive controversies, the foundations of theology. Nor is he a Jerome, so dead to the world that he can imitate the point and wit of its writers without danger to himself or scandal to his brethren. He has not trampled upon heresy, nor smitten emperors, nor beautified the house or the service of God, nor knit together the portions of Christendom, nor founded a religious order, nor built up the framework of doctrine, nor expounded the science of the saints; yet I love him, as I love David or St. Paul.

How am I to account for it? It has not happened to me, as it might happen to many a man, that I have devoted time and toil to the study of his writings or of his history, and cry up that upon which I have made an outlay, or love what has become familiar to me. Cases may occur when our admiration for an author is only admiration of our own comments on him, and when our love of an old acquaintance is only our love of old times. For me, I have not written the life of Chrysostom,



nor translated his works, nor studied Scripture in his exposition, nor forged weapons of controversy out of his sayings or his doings. Nor is his eloquence of a kind to carry any one away who has ever so little knowledge of the oratory of Greece and Rome. It is not force of words, nor cogency of argument, nor harmony of composition, nor depth or richness of thought, which constitutes his power,—whence, then, has he this influence, so mysterious, yet so strong?

I consider St. Chrysostom's charm to lie in his intimate sympathy and compassionateness for the whole world, not only in its strength, but in its weakness; in the lively regard with which he views every thing that comes before him, taken in the concrete, both as made after its own kind and as gifted with a nature higher than its own. Not that any religious man, above all, not that any saint, could possibly contrive to abstract the love of the work from the love of its Maker, or could feel a tenderness for earth which did not spring from devotion to heaven; or as if he would not love every thing just in that degree in which the Creator loves it, and according to the measure of gifts which the Creator has bestowed upon it, and preëminently for the Creator's sake. But this is the characteristic of all saints; and I am speaking, not of what St. Chrysostom had in common with others, but what he had special to himself; and this specialty, I conceive, is the interest which he takes in all things, not so far as God has made them alike, but as He has made them different from each other. I speak of the discriminating affectionateness with which he accepts every one for what is personal in him and unlike others. I speak of his versatile recognition of men, one by one, for the sake of that portion of good, be it more or less, of a lower order or a higher, which has severally been lodged in them; his eager contemplation of the many things they do, effect, or produce, of all their great works, as nations or as states; nay, even as they are corrupted or disguised by evil, so far as that evil may in imagination be disjoined from their proper nature, or may be regarded as a mere material disorder apart from its formal character of guilt. I speak of the kindly spirit and the genial temper with which he looks round at all things which this wonderful world contains; of the graphic fidelity with which he notes them down upon the tablets of his mind, and of the promptitude and propriety with which he calls them up as arguments or illustrations in the course of his teaching as the occasion requires. Possessed though he be by the fire of divine charity, he has not lost one fibre, he does not drop one vibration, of the complicated whole of human sentiment and affection; like the miraculous bush in

the desert, which, for all the flame that wrapt it round, was not thereby consumed.

Such, in a transcendent perfection, was the gaze, as we may reverently suppose, with which the loving Father of all surveyed in eternity that universe even in its minutest details which He had decreed to create; such the loving pity with which He spoke the word when the due moment came, and began to mould the finite, as He created it, in His infinite hands; such the watchful solicitude with which He now keeps His catalogue of the innumerable birds of heaven, and counts day by day the very hairs of our head and the alternations of our breathing. Such, much more, is the awful contemplation with which He encompasses incessantly every one of those souls on whom He heaps His mercies here, in order to make them the intimate associates of His own eternity hereafter. And we too, in our measure, are bound to imitate Him in our exact and vivid apprehension of Himself and of His works. As to Himself, we love Him, not simply in His nature, but in His triple personality, lest we become mere pantheists. And so, again, we choose our patron saints, not for what they have in common with each other (else there could be no room for choice at all), but for what is peculiar to them severally. What is my warrant, therefore, for particular devotions at all, becomes my reason for devotion to St. John Chrysostom. In him I recognise a special pattern of that very gift of discrimination. He may indeed be said in some sense to have a devotion of his own for every one who comes across him,—for persons, ranks, classes, callings, societies, considered as divine works and the subjects of his good offices or good will.

It is this observant benevolence which gives to his exposition of Scripture its chief characteristic. He is known in ecclesiastical literature as the expounder, above all others, of its literal sense. Now in mystical comments the direct object which the writer sets before him is the Divine Author Himself of the written Word. Such a writer sees in Scripture, not so much the works of God, as His nature and attributes; the Teacher more than the definite teaching, or its human instruments, with their drifts and motives, their courses of thought, their circumstances and personal peculiarities. He loses the creature in the glory which surrounds the Creator. The problem before him is not what the inspired writer meant and why, but, out of the myriad of meanings present to the Infinite Being who inspired him, which it is that is most illustrative of that great Being's all-holy attributes and solemn dispositions. Thus, in the Psalter, he will drop David and



Israel and the Temple altogether, and will recognise nothing there but the shadows of those greater truths which remain for ever. Accordingly, the mystical comment will be of an objective character; whereas a writer who delights to ponder human nature and human affairs, to analyse the workings of the mind, and to contemplate what is subjective to it, is naturally drawn to investigate the sense of the sacred writer himself, who was the organ of the revelation, that is, the literal sense. Now, in the instance of St. Chrysostom, it so happens that literal exposition is the historical characteristic of the school in which he was brought up; so that if he commented on Scripture at all, he would have adopted that method; still, there have been many literal expositors, but only one Chrysostom. It is St. Chrysostom who is the charm of the method, not the method that is the charm of St. Chrysostom.

That charm lies, as I have said, in his habit and his power of throwing himself into the minds of others, and of imagining with exactness and with sympathy circumstances or scenes which were not before him. This is why his mode of writing is so peculiar, and why, when once a student enters into it, he will ever recognise it wherever he meets with it. I could not explain in a few sentences what I vividly feel; yet I will refer in illustration to two or three of his remarks on St. Matthew, as they stand in the *Aurea Catena*.

I turn, almost at hazard, to the beginning of the seventeenth chapter, in which the Transfiguration is related. Our Lord took three Apostles up into the mountain, six days after He had said, that some of those then present should not die before they had seen His glory. Now Remigius observes on this, that the Transfiguration is the fulfilment of this announcement. St. Jerome reconciles these six days with St. Luke's eight. Raban observes, that the six days stand for the six ages which precede the resurrection. Origen, that the six days carry us back to the six days of creation. But Chrysostom views them as illustrating our Lord's tenderness towards his half-trained Apostles; thus: "He does not take them up at once, but after six days, to avoid making the other disciples jealous," or that the three favoured disciples might by the delay "become kindled with a more eager desire."

Again; our Lord takes with him three Apostles, to signify, says St. Hilary, the three stocks of Sem, Cham, and Japhet;—"because many are called," says Raban, "and few chosen," and to remind of the Holy Trinity;—to show that those who seek God must mount up, says Remigius. But Chrysostom

is led from it to remark, "how St. Matthew does not conceal that three others were preferred to himself, just as John records the preëminent honour given by our Lord to Peter."

And so, again, as to the appearance of Moses and Elias in the glory, Origen says, that it denotes that there is a hidden Christian wisdom in the Law and the Prophets. Hilary, that the Israelites will be judged in the presence of those who preached to them. Jerome, that the Apostles gained what the Pharisees were refused, viz. Elias a sign from the heaven above, Moses a sign from the depth beneath, as the prophet proposed to Achaz. But Chrysostom gives, among other reasons, this, viz. that it was to comfort Peter and the others, who were so much frightened at the thought of His death, with the example of Moses and Elias, who had witnessed before tyrants, yet were now in glory.

"It is good for us to be here," &c. shows, says Remigius, that St. Peter, transported by the vision, wished to remain on the mountain for ever. St. Jerome says, "Thou art wrong, Peter; if thou must build them tabernacles, build for Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and let their dwelling-place be, not on the mountain, but in thine own bosom." Raban observes that the Apostle was wrong in thinking there could be tabernacles in that abiding city, in which is no temple. But Chrysostom says, "Peter fears for Christ, when Moses and Elias speak of his death at Jerusalem; so, shunning a second rebuke, if he should say again, 'Lord, be it far from Thee!' he insinuates the same sentiment in the words, 'It is good to be here.'"

There are, comparatively speaking, few passages from the Saint in the Roman Breviary, as being a Greek Father; but such as are found there would supply fresh instances of what I have been pointing out. For instance, on the octave of St. John, he is led to observe, from the narrative in the Evangelist's 21st chapter, that as St. John had done a kindness to St. Peter, in once asking our Lord for his sake, at the last supper, a question which he dared not put himself, so, when our Lord had foretold Peter's coming history, Peter said, "Lord, and what shall this man do?" in order to repay him a good turn, by asking what St. John would be backward in proposing himself.

Again, on the octave of the Holy Innocents, he traces out the succession of alternating joys and sorrows which came upon St. Joseph. And so within the octave of Corpus Christi, when he is expounding the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, he throws his dogmatic statement into an ethical form, congenial to his own affectionate tone of thought. "Parents,"



he says, "often put out their children to suckle ; but I, says Christ, am not such, for I feed you from Myself."

It was to be expected that such a man would have a special devotion to St. Paul ; and I have incidentally instanced it in a former chapter. In the second Sunday after Epiphany he confesses it, and in language quite in keeping with the general cast of his mind. "When I listen to the reading of his Epistles," he says, "I am roused, and I kindle with my longing after him, recognising in him a voice dear to myself, and seeming to behold his very presence, and to hear him preach. And, if I know any thing about him, I know it, not from any talent peculiar to me, but because my abundant affection for him keeps me to the study of his writings ; for those who love a man know more about him than others do, as having a solicitude for his person."

The loving scrutiny with which he followed the Apostles, he practised in various ways towards all men, living and dead, high and low, those whom he admires and those whom he weeps over. I mean, he writes as one who was ever looking out with sharp but kind eyes upon the world of men and their history ; and hence he has always something to produce about them, new or old, to the purpose of his argument, whether from books or from the experience of life. Head and heart were full to overflowing with a stream of mingled "wine and milk," of rich vigorous thought and affectionate feeling. "What shall I do?" he cries out, in the midst of his comment on a passage in St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians (and to his comment on this Epistle I shall confine the instances I propose to give),—"What shall I do? I would fain be silent, but am not able. Come, rouse up, as if I were fresh beginning my discourse, and be as fresh yourselves in your attention. I would fain break it off, but it will not suffer me ; just as a man in the midst of his draught cannot bear to interrupt it." And then, as soon as he has entered upon his new topic, he interrupts himself again. "Many thoughts," he says, "throng me all at once ; I know not which to utter first, which next ; therefore, let no one require order of me." And then he goes on to enlarge upon the glory of the Apostle as the "prisoner of the Lord :"

"Mighty is the power of God's chain ! What would I not give for a sight of the Apostle bound and sitting in prison ! Do you see the emperors, the consuls, borne aloft in their chariots, and arrayed in gold, and their body-guard all gold ? their halberds of gold, their shields of gold, their raiment of gold, their horses with trappings of gold ? I would rather see Paul once, going forth from the

other prisoners, than behold this parade ten thousand times over. How many angels, suppose ye, led the way before Him ?”\*

This is an illustration from the great ones of the earth ; but at another time he draws his lesson from the most degraded :

“A man is not so disfigured,” he says, “when stripped of his clothes as when stripped of his virtue. If you happen to see any one going bare through the public square, does not the sight annoy you ? Do not we pity those beggars, mountebanks as we call them ? At the same time we do not excuse them, if they have lost their clothes by gambling. How, then, as to ourselves ; if we lose the garment which God has given, will He pardon us ? Whenever the devil sees a man stripped of it, he at once bruises and blackens his face, and drives him into great straits.”

At another time he points to the pagan worship, which even then was to be seen around him, when he would denounce “covetousness, which is idolatry.”

“Thou slayest no sheep ; no, but thou slayest men. When thou passest by the idol’s altar here, thou shalt see it reeking with blood of bullocks and goats ; but pass by the altar of covetousness, and thou shalt find it breathing the shocking stench of human blood. There are no birds burning there, no steam, no smoke, but the bodies of men perish there ; for some cast themselves headlong, others hang themselves, others cut their throats. Wouldst thou see sacrifices more shocking still ? it is the souls of men lying slain in the other world. The slaughter of the soul is awful and terrific.”

Then, again, he would enforce seriousness of mind, and he appeals to the conduct of soldiers in camp or on campaign :

“Art thou laughing and jesting ? It is war-time ; and hast thou in thy hands the toys of dancers ? Look at the countenances of men in battle, their dark concentrated mien, their brow terrible and full of awe. Mark the stern eye, the heart eager, beating and throbbing, their spirit collected, trembling, and intensely anxious. All is good order, all is good discipline, all is silence in the camp ; they utter, I will not say, no impertinent word, but not so much as a whisper. Now if they who have visible enemies, and who are in nowise injured by words, yet observe so great silence, dost thou, who hast in words thy warfare, and the chief of thy warfare, dost thou leave this side of thee naked and exposed ? Art thou amusing and enjoying thyself, and speaking pleasantries, and raising a laugh, and regarding it all as a mere nothing ? How many perjuries, how many injuries, how many immodest speeches, have come of plea-

\* I use the Oxford translation of 1840, abridged and freely transcribed.



santries! It is a time of war now and of fighting, of watch and ward, of arming and arraying."

In like manner he enforces the duty of resignation to the will of God from what we witness in the manual arts. "Go to the carpenter's shop; thou dost not examine his reasons, though thou understandest not one of the things which are done there, and many things will appear to thee difficulties; as, for instance, when he hollows the wood, when he shapes it. Nay, still more, the painter. Does he not seem to be working at random? what do his lines mean, their turns and bendings? however, when he comes to put on the colours, the beauty of his art is brought out." He passes on to the instinct of animals: "But why do I speak of carpenters and painters? How does the bee frame her comb? Master the handiwork of the ant, spider, swallow, and then thou hast leave to speak about God also."

At another time he has recourse to the bee for a lesson of sweet temper, in a passage which reminds us of St. Francis de Sales:

"As bees will never settle down in an unclean vessel, and accordingly those who are skilled in these matters sprinkle the spot with perfumes, and scented oils, and burnt odours; and the wicker baskets also, in which they will have to settle as soon as they come out of the hives, with fragrant wines and all other sweets, that there may be no noisome smell to annoy them and drive them away again, so in truth is it with the Holy Spirit. Our soul is a sort of vessel or basket, capable of receiving the swarms of spiritual gifts; but if there shall be within it gall and bitterness, the swarms will fly away. Hence this blessed and wise Husbandman well and thoroughly cleanses our vessels, holding neither knife nor other instrument of iron, and invites us to this spiritual swarm; and as He gathers it, He cleanses us with prayers and labours and other observances."

He contrasts with this gentleness and good-humour that bitterness of nature of which gall or bile is the indication, and still with an illustration carefully worked out. This bitterness is "like some very fierce and frightful wild-beast, that has been brought into a city. As long as it is confined in its cage, however it may rage and roar, it can do no harm. But let its wrath get the better of it, and it break its bars, and contrive to leap out, it fills the city with all sorts of confusion and disturbance, and puts every one to flight." He gives an instance of it:

"Women, whenever they are angry with their maid-servants, fill the whole house with their noise. And often too, if the house is in a narrow street, then all the passers-by hear the mistress scolding

and the maid weeping and wailing. All the women round immediately look out at window, and ask, 'What's the matter?' 'It is so and so beating her maid.' What a shame! What is more base still, some are savage enough to lash them; they strip them, call in their husbands, and often tie them to the pallets. Alas! at that moment, tell me, does not the thought of hell come over you? What, strip your handmaid, and expose her to your husband! And then you threaten to put her in chains, having first taunted the poor creature with ten thousand reproachful names — witch, runaway, and the like. 'Ay,' say you, 'but they are a troublesome, audacious, impudent, incorrigible set. The whole tribe of slaves is incorrigible, if it meet with indulgence.' True, I know it myself; but there are other ways to keep them in order. You, who are a gentlewoman, have uttered foul words, and you disgrace yourself no less than her. Then, if she shall have occasion to go out to the bath, there are bruises on her back. If she is a believer, she is your sister. Are you not her keeper? has she not a soul as well as you? has she not been vouchsafed the same privileges? does she not partake of the same table? does she not share with you the same high birth? Now, some have come to such a height of indecency as to uncover the head, and to drag their maid-servants by the hair. Why do you all blush? I am not addressing myself to all, but to those who are carried away into such brutal conduct."

Elsewhere he compares the spirit of ambition and jealousy in the Church to a conflagration, and the passage is so striking, and so applicable to his own after experience at Constantinople, that, long as it is, I must ask permission to quote it:

"Ye have oftentimes been present at the burning of large houses. Ye have seen how the smoke keeps rising up to heaven; and if no one comes near to put a stop to the mischief, but every one keeps looking to himself, the flame spreads freely on and devours every thing. And oftentimes the whole city will stand round; they will stand round, indeed, as spectators of the evil, not to aid or assist. And then you may see them one and all standing round and doing nothing, each individual perhaps stretching out his hand and pointing out to some one who may be just come to the spot either a flaming brand that moment flying through a window, or beams and rafters hurled down, or the whole circuit of the walls forced out and tumbling violently to the ground. Many, too, there are of the more daring and venturesome sort who will have the hardihood even to come close to the very buildings themselves whilst they are burning, not in order so much as to stretch forth a hand towards them and to put a stop to the mischief, but only that they may be able to take a closer survey of all those things which usually escape the notice of those at a distance, and so may the more fully enjoy the sight. Then, if the house still further happen to be large and magnificent, they will look upon it as a pitiable spectacle, and de-



serving of many tears. And truly there is a pitiable spectacle for us to behold, capitals of columns crumbled to dust, and many columns themselves shattered to pieces ; some consumed by the fire, others thrown down often by the very hands which erected them, that they may not add fuel to the flame. Statues, again, which stood with so much gracefulness, with the ceiling resting upon them, these you may see all exposed, with the roof torn off, and themselves standing hideously disfigured in the open air. And why should one go on to describe the wealth stored up within ; the tissues and perfumes, and the caskets of costly jewels, all turned into one blazing pile, and within it now bathing-men, and beggars, and runaway slaves, and all who choose ; and every thing within one mass of fire and water, of mud and dust and half-burnt beams !

Now why have I drawn out so full a picture as this ? not simply because I wish to represent to you the conflagration of a house (for what concern is that of mine ?), but because I wish to set before your eyes as vividly as I can the calamities of the Church. For like a conflagration, a conflagration in very deed, or like a thunder-bolt hurled from on high, have they lighted upon the roof of the Church, and yet they rouse no one ; but whilst our Father's house is burning, we are slumbering on in a deep and stupid sleep. And yet who is there whom this fire does not touch ? which of the statues that stand in the Church ? for the Church is nothing else than a house built of the souls of us men. Now this house is not of equal honour throughout ; but of the stones which combine to form it, some are bright and shining, whilst others are smaller and more dull than they, and yet superior, again, to others. There we may see many who are in the place of gold also, the gold which adorns the ceiling. Others, again, we may see who give the beauty and gracefulness produced by statues. Many we may see standing like pillars, giving great gracefulness, not by their support only, but by their beauty also, and having their heads overlaid with gold. We may see a multitude forming generally the wide middle space and the whole extent of the circumference : for the body at large occupies the place of those stones of which the outer walls are built. Or rather, we must go on to a more splendid picture yet. This Church of which I speak is not built of these stones, such as we see around us, but of gold and silver and of precious stones ; and there is abundance of gold dispersed every where throughout it. But oh, the bitter tears this calls forth ! for all these things hath the lawless rule of vain-glory consumed ; that all-devouring flame, which no one has yet brought under. And we stand gazing in amazement at the flames, but no longer able to quench the evil ; or if we do quench it for a short time, yet, after two or three days, like a spark blown up from a heap of ashes, it will overturn all and consume all which it had not consumed before. Such, I say, is the case here ; and this is just what is wont to happen in such a conflagration. And the cause is this : The foundations of the very pillars of the Church have been lost to us ; those who supported the roof, and

who formerly held the whole building together, have been enveloped in the flame. Hence too was a ready communication to the rest of the outer walls ; for so also in the case of buildings, when the fire lays hold of the timbers, it is better armed for its attack upon the stones ; but when it has brought down the pillars and levelled them with the ground, nothing more is wanted to consume all the rest in the flames. For when the props and supports of the upper parts fall down, those parts also themselves will speedily enough follow them. Thus it is also at this moment with the Church ; the fire has taken hold on every part. We seek the honours which come from man, or burn for glory. We have forsaken the Lord, and are become slaves of honour. We are no longer able to rebuke those who are under our rule and guidance, because we ourselves are possessed of the same fever as they. We who are appointed by God to heal others need the physician ourselves."

This extract brings us to the history of his banishment, which I have left in order to enlarge upon the character of his mind and of his teaching. The evils which he thus denounced at Antioch came to a crisis at Constantinople, and he himself was the principal victim of them. His cause was that of the strict party in the Church, and the fire of envy and malice, of which he speaks, burst forth against him as its representative. For a time, in a city which boasted that it never had been pagan, the goodly fabric of Christianity was little better than a heap of ruins. The transportation of its saintly Bishop was the signal for a schism which it took years to heal ; and, worse still, it was a triumph of the secular party, which has never been reversed down to this day. In the present state of the Greek Church we read the moral of the conflict in which St. Chrysostom was engaged. Accordingly, there was much of significance in the coincidence, that, on the very day on which he was carried over to Asia, fire literally did break out in the cathedral, where he had so lately preached, and in his very pulpit. "There suddenly appeared," to use the words of Fleury, "a great flame in the church, from the pulpit from which he used to preach. The fire ascended to the roof, and then burst forth on the outside, so that it was burnt to the ground. The flames, driven by a violent wind, spanned the square like a bridge, seized upon the palace where the senate assembled, and burnt it down in three hours. The Catholics looked upon it as a miracle ; some accused the schismatical party of it ; they, and after them the pagans, imputed it to the Catholics." However originating, it typified the spiritual devastation of the Church of Constantinople.

The court party would perhaps give the catastrophe a



different application: they might see in it the fortunes of St. Chrysostom himself. Thus blazed and burnt out, they might say, the glories of that eloquent preacher, who had been so hastily brought to the imperial city. It was a great pity that he had ever left Antioch; for what had he done since he came but create confusion in the Church? No one denied his oratorical powers; but he had neither discretion nor patience; and, after two or three years, here was the end of it. As some brilliant meteor, he had glared and disappeared. He thought, forsooth, to get back from banishment; but that never would be. His enemies were far too strong and too determined to allow of the chance of it. They were resolved utterly to blot out his name and his memory; he would be written in the sand; posterity would not know him, except as one who had caused great scandals, and had undergone the penalty of them.

Such anticipations, plausible as they were, have been falsified by the event; the cause of truth and sanctity cannot utterly be defeated, however poor be the measure of justice which is accorded to it even on the long-run. The saint, however, was over-sanguine, as we have seen, in his anticipations of a contrary kind. He was at length, indeed, brought back in triumph to his see; but he was brought back in his coffin. That first momentary presentiment, when he took leave of his deaconesses at Constantinople, was the true one. His earthly career was coming to an end. Here, then, we are come round to the point from which I have digressed, and I resume the narrative where I left off.

The reader may recollect that St. Chrysostom got to Cucusus in the autumn. His enemies seemed to have hoped that the winter would complete for them what they had begun; he, on the contrary, looked forward to it with cheerfulness. Both parties were disappointed; it did not kill him, but it inflicted on him great suffering; it told most for his enemies, for they would infer that he could not possibly bear the recurrence of many such trials.

In the early spring of the following year (405) he wrote to Olympias thus:

“I write to you after a recovery from the very gates of death; on this account it was a great joy to me that your servants have not reached me till now, when I am getting into port; for, had they come while I was still tossing out at sea, and shipping the heavy waves of my illness, it would not have been easy for me to deceive you with good tidings, when there could only be bad. The winter was more severe than usual, and brought on, what was

worse than itself, my stomach complaint ; and for two whole months I was no better than the dead, or even worse. So far I lived as to be alive to the miseries that encompassed me ; day, dawn, and noon, all were night to me ; I was confined to my bed all day. With a thousand contrivances, I could not avoid the mischief which the cold did me ; though I had a fire, and submitted to the oppressive smoke, and imprisoned myself in one room, and had coverings without number, and never ventured to pass the threshold, nevertheless I used to suffer in the most grievous way from continual vomitings, headache, disgust at food, and obstinate sleeplessness, through the long interminable nights. But I will not distress you longer with this account of my troubles ; I am now rid of them all" (*Ep.* 6).

Later in the spring he reports that the marauding bands had again made their appearance.

*To Theodotus.*

"It was no slight relief in the desolateness of this place to be able to write frequently to you ; but even this resource has been cut off by the circumstance of these Isaurian troubles. For, as soon as spring came, the brigands shot forth with it, and spread themselves out over all the roads, to the stoppage of all traffic. Free women were carried off and men slain. I know how anxious you are to know about my health. After serious suffering in the past winter, I am now somewhat getting round, though I am still distressed by the changes in the weather. Winter is in force even now ; however, I look forward to be rid of the remains of my illness when summer is fairly come. Indeed, nothing so tries me as cold, nothing does me so much good as summer and the comfort of being warm" (*Ep.* 140).

In thus speaking hopefully of the approaching summer, he did but show his cheerful temper ; for, when it actually came, he was forced to confess to some friends, "The summer distresses me not less than the cold" (*Ep.* 146). Earth and sea temper the sky for us, and keep the atmosphere in a due medium of heat and cold. But Chrysostom was in a desert country, which gave him no protection against weather of any kind, neither against the sun nor against the frost.

Yet his spirit did not sink under his disappointing experience of the climate, as the following letter shows :

*To Castor.*

"I know well it will be a great pleasure to you to learn how I fare. I am rid of my weakness of stomach ; I am well ; and, in spite of beleaguering, raids, loneliness, and a host of misfortunes, I am in no depression or trouble of mind, and am in the enjoyment of security, leisure, quiet, and keep your matters daily in my thoughts, and talk of them with all who visit me" (*Ep.* 130).



However, as autumn drew on, and his first year was completed, the face of things altered. Whether the barbarians were stronger, or the garrison at Cucusus had been weakened or removed; whether it was some scheme of the saint's enemies to bring about a death which as yet they had not effected, so it was, that at the beginning of winter he was persuaded, or he found, that he was not safe at Cucusus; the gates of the city were thrown open to him, and he was advised or obliged to leave it for the mountain region in the neighbourhood. Old as he was, enfeebled by recent illness, ignorant of the country and sensitive to the climate, and, as it would appear, without attendants, he had to face the wild winter as he best could, and to wander from village to village, according as the alarm of the Isaurians chased him to and fro. In this way he advanced at length to the distance of sixty miles from Cucusus, to a city called Arabissus. He knew the Bishop of this place, and it was professedly defended by a fortress, which at least served for its own defence. Into this fortress he threw himself; it was a prison rather than a place of refuge, but at least it was secure; and when he fell ill again of the cold there, he got some sort of medical aid, though medicines were not to be procured. At this time he writes as follows:

*To Nicolas.*

"Lately I have been flitting from place to place in the very depth of winter, now in towns, now in ravines and woods, driven to and fro by the inroads of the Isaurians. When this disturbance had at length abated a little, I left these desolate places, and betook myself to Arabissus; not to the town, for that is as much unsafe as they are, but to the fortress, which, however, in spite of its being safer, was a worse dwelling than any prison. And, besides the imminent prospect of death day by day from the Isaurians, who were making their attacks in every direction, and destroying human beings and houses by fire and sword, I am in dread of famine too, from our want of resources, and the number who have taken refuge here. And I have had to endure a tedious illness, brought on by the winter and my incessant wanderings, and I still carry the remains of it, though I have recovered from its violence" (*Ep.* 69).

*To Polybius.*

"I lament your separation from me as a heavier trial than this desolateness, my illness, and the winter. The winter, indeed, has added to it; for it has deprived me of that intercourse by letter, which was my sole relief of your most painful absence; roads being blocked up by vast drifts of snow, and the passage interrupted, whether from the outward world hither, or from hence to you. And now the same obstruction is caused by fear of the Isaurians; nay,

much greater, increasing the desolateness, putting into confusion, flight, and exile the whole population. No one any longer endures to remain at home ; all leave their dwellings and scamper off. The cities are but walls and roofs ; and the ravines and woods are cities. We, who dwell in Armenia, are obliged to run from place to place day after day, living the life of nomads and strollers, from fear to settle any where ; such confusion reigns. When the plunderers come up, they slaughter, burn, enslave ; when they are even rumoured, they put to flight the inhabitants of the cities, nay, I may say, murder them also ; for the young children, who have been suddenly forced to fly, as if smoked out of their houses, in the dead of night, often in hard frost, have needed no Isaurian sword, but have been frozen to death in the snow" (*Ep.* 127).

To another friend he says, "In whatever direction you go, you will see torrents of blood, heaps of corpses, houses demolished, cities sacked" (*Ep.* 68). He seems to have been besieged at Arabissus, from the following passage :

*To Theodotus.*

"The troubles of the siege increase daily, and here we are seated in this fort as in a trap. Just at midnight, when no one expected it, a band of three hundred Isaurians spread through the city, and were all but getting possession of me. However, the hand of God took them off again before I knew any thing about it, so that I escaped the alarm as well as the danger ; and, when day was come, then at last I heard what had chanced" (*Ep.* 133).

At length the storm blew over, and he was in comparative security, and he remained in the place for nearly the whole of his second year of exile (A.D. 406). He was able to employ himself in teaching the poor people, and he contrived, by means of the money sent him by friends, to relieve their wants when a famine set in. Before the year was over, he returned to Cucusus.

A third winter came, and brought its usual hardships along with it. We find the saint again weak and suffering at the beginning of A.D. 407 ; but by this time he was in some measure acclimated to the place, and he was able to express content at the state of his health.

*To Elpidius.*

"I have learned at last to bear the Armenian winter, with some suffering, indeed, such as may be expected in the instance of so feeble a frame, but still with real success. This is, by means of rigidly confining myself indoors when the cold is unbearable. As to the other seasons, I find them most pleasant and enjoyable, so as to enable me comfortably to recover from the illness brought on by the winter" (*Ep.* 142).



And to Olympias :

“ Do not be anxious on my account. It is true that the winter was what the season is in Armenia ; one need say no more ; but it has not done me any great harm, since I take great precautions against it. I keep up a constant fire, and have every part of my small room closed. I put on a great deal of clothing, and I never stir out. A few days ago, nothing would stay on my stomach, from the severity of the weather. I took, among other remedies, the medicine which Syncletium gave me, and, after using it, I got well by the end of three days. I had a second attack ; I used it again, and got completely well. Do not, then, make yourself anxious about my wintering here, for I feel much easier and better than I did last year” (*Ep.* 4).

It was at this date that he wrote to the same correspondent the striking letter, part of which I quoted in my foregoing chapter ; in which he confidently foretells his return from banishment, on the ground of his having been so wonderfully preserved hitherto, and enabled to triumph over the accumulated trials which bodily weakness, the seasons, and his wanderings and privations brought upon him. So hopefully for him, so unsatisfactorily for his enemies, opened the third year of his exile at the place which was to have been his death.

But the fairer were his prospects, the more certain was their disappointment. He was in their hands ; they had sentenced him to die, and only hesitated how his death was to be brought about. They had no wish to do the deed themselves, if it could be done without them ; but do it they must, if circumstances would not do it for them. Cucusus promised to spare them the odium of his murder ; and doubtless they would listen with complacency to the complaints about his discomforts and his ailments which from time to time he transmitted to Constantinople. It was easy to fancy them the tokens of a broken spirit, and the harbingers of the consummation they desired, when they were but his protests against injustice and cruelty, and the spontaneous relief of a soul too great to care about being misconceived. When time went on, and the end did not come, when even his wanderings in the mountains and his flight to Arabissus did not subdue him, they were prompted to more violent and summary dealings with him.

He must be carried off to some still more inhospitable region ; he must undergo the slow torture of a still more exhausting journey. Cold and heat, wind and rain, night-air, bad lodging, unwholesome water, long foot-marches, rough-paced mules,—these were to be the instruments of his martyrdom.

He was to die by inches ; want of sleep, want of rest, want of food and medicine, and the collapse which followed them, were to extinguish the brave spirit which hitherto had risen superior to all sorrows. A rescript was gained from the Emperor Arcadius, banishing him to Pityus upon the north-east coast of the Euxine.

In that sentence the curtain falls upon the history of the saint. His correspondence ceases ; the letter, so full of sunshine, to which I have several times referred, was apparently his last. He leaves us with the language of hope upon his lips. It is well that he should thus close the great drama, in which he was the chief actor. Bright, pleasant thoughts, nought but what is radiant, nought but what is enlivening and consolatory, attaches to the historical memory of St. Chrysostom. But the devout heart seeks to lift the veil ; it desires even amid the changes of mortality *notas audire et reddere voces* : it would fain be near to comfort him in his agony, and to hear his last cry.

It may not be ; when his letters would be most precious, they are, as I have said, denied to us. In the case of a saint, we are left to faith. It has been otherwise with others. There was a Protestant missionary, in the first years of this century, who, after attempting the conversion of a Mahometan country, was committed to the rough charge of a Tartar courier, not for exile, but for return to his own England. Hurried on by forced journeys, and having at the time a deadly malady upon him, he gradually sank under the cruel punishment, and breathed out his wearied spirit at the very spot which, 1400 years before, had witnessed the death of John Chrysostom. Let us trust that that zealous preacher came under the shadow of the Catholic doctor, that he touched the bones of Eliseus, and that, all errors forgiven, he lives to God through the intercession of the Confessor, to whom in place and manner of death he was united. The friends of Henry Martyn are in possession of his journal up to within ten days of his death ; for us, we must wait till we are admitted to the company of St. Chrysostom above, if such be our blessedness, before we know the last sufferings, the last thoughts, the prayers and consolations, the patience, sweetness, gentleness, and charity in his death, of that great mind.

Let us glean what we can from history and tradition of that last unknown journey.

First, we know that Pityus is on the very verge of the Roman empire, to the north of Colchis, close to Sarmatia, and under the Caucasus. It had been a large and rich city in an earlier century, and was situated in a region so peculiarly a



border country, that in Dioscurias, which lay south of it, as many as seventy languages or dialects were spoken. From that city it was distant about fifty miles, and Dioscurias was distant as much as 280 miles from Trapezus.\* This portion, however, of his journey was held in reserve for the Saint's destruction: he never got so far as Trapezus; and it concerns us more to consider how he travelled towards it. There were three routes from Cucusus thither; the most direct lay through Melitene and Satala; but this he certainly did not pursue, or he could not have died in the neighbourhood of Neocæsarea. To direct his course to Neocæsarea, he must have passed through Sebaste, and Sebaste he might reach by either of two routes,—by Cæsarea or by Melitene. Both of these were high military roads, and beyond Sebaste he might be helped on by another high road at least as far as Sebastopolis on the Lycus, which is either 365 or 330 miles from Cucusus, according to the route which was chosen for him. Thus we may say, that it took, more or less, 400 miles to kill him. The narrative which I shall presently transcribe says, that his journey lasted three months, which is hardly conceivable, unless he was detained from time to time by illness or other causes on the way.

So much for his route; next, as to the place of his death, we have historical information that he died at Comana in Pontus; and thence it was that his sacred body was conveyed some years afterwards to Constantinople.

Then, as to the day: Socrates tell us that it was the 14th of September, the day since set apart, in consequence of the events of later history, as the feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross.

So far we can speak without hesitation; but when we set ourselves to trace the occurrences of his closing months, and the particulars of his journey, we find ourselves without any materials for the undertaking. We have neither public documents nor the private letters of himself or of his friends to assist us in the task. The narrative which commonly, and by great authorities, is received as authentic, is written by one of his contemporaries and friends; but he was no eye-witness of what he relates, nor does not tell us how he got possessed of it. However, I present it to the reader as it stands:

“The rescript,” said Palladius, “ordered that he should be transported to Pityus, a most wild place of the Tyanians, lying on the coast of the Euxine. And the Prætorian soldiers, who conveyed him, urged him forward on his journey with

\* Smith's Dictionary.

such haste, saying that it was according to their orders, that it appeared as if their promotion depended on his dying in the course of it. One, indeed, of them, having less solicitude for this earthly warfare, secretly showed him some sort of kindness; but the other carried his brutality so far as even to take as an affront the very attentions which were shown to himself by strangers, with the hope of softening him towards his prisoner, having this solicitude, and no other, that John should miserably die. So, when rain was profuse, the man went on, not caring for it, so that floods of water poured down the bishop's back and breast; and again, the fierce heat of the sun he considered a treat, as knowing that the bald head of blessed Eliseus would suffer from it. Moreover at city or village, where the refreshment of a bath was to be found, the wretch would not consent to stop for a moment.

“And all these sufferings the Saint endured for three months, travelling that most difficult way with the brightness of a star, baked red by the sun as fruit upon the top branches of a tree. And when they came to Comana, they passed through it as if its street were no more than a bridge, and halted outside the walls at the shrine, which is five or six miles in advance.

“In that very night the martyr of the place stood before him, Basiliscus by name, who had been Bishop of Comana, and died by martyrdom in Nicomedia, in the reign of Maximinus, together with Lucian of Bithynia, who had been a priest of Antioch. And he said, ‘Be of good heart, brother John, for to-morrow we shall be together.’ It is said that the martyr had already made the same announcement to the priest of the place: ‘Prepare the place for brother John, for he is coming.’ And John, believing the divine oracle, upon the morrow besought his guards to remain there until the fifth hour. They refused, and set forward; but when they had proceeded about thirty stadia, he was so ill that they returned back to the martyr's shrine whence they had started.

“When he got there, he asked for white vestments, suitable to the tenor of his past life; and taking off his clothes of travel, he clad himself in them from head to foot, being still fasting, and then gave away his old ones to those about him. Then, having communicated in the symbols of the Lord, he made the closing prayer *On present needs*. He said his customary words, ‘Glory be to God for all things;’ and having concluded it with his last Amen, he stretched forth those feet of his which had been so beautiful in their running, whether to convey salvation to the penitent or reproof to the



hardened in sin. . . . And being gathered to his fathers, and shaking off this mortal dust, he passed to Christ."

The translation of his relics to Constantinople took place a little more than thirty years afterwards. "A great multitude of the faithful," says Theodoret, "crowded the sea in vessels, and lighted up a part of the Bosphorus, near the mouth of the Propontis, with torches. These sacred treasures were brought to the city by the present emperor (Theodosius the Younger). He laid his face upon the coffin, and intreated that his parents might be forgiven for having so unadvisedly persecuted the Bishop."\*

So died, and so was buried, St. John Chrysostom, one of that select company whom men begin to understand and honour when they are removed from them. It is the general law of the world, which the new law of the Gospel has not reversed:

"Virtutem incolumem odimus,  
Sublatam ex oculis quærimus, invidi."

O.

---

### THE SPIRIT-RAPPERS.

MR. HOLMES, the humorous philosopher of Boston, says with some truth that spiritualism is the modern plague of theology. Whether it is a delusion of the devil, an hysteric folly, or a mischievous trick, American spiritualism is quietly undermining the traditional ideas of a future state, not merely in those who believe in it, but in the general sentiment of the community. You cannot have people of cultivation and character—judges, men of business, men of science—professing to be in communication with the spiritual world, and keeping up constant intercourse with it, without its gradually reacting on the whole conception of the other life.

In England, I suppose, we do not find grave judges and shrewd men of business generally making any such profession; but that spiritualism is making its way among us is clear even from the pages of the *Cornhill Magazine*. A journal of which 100,000 copies are sold, and whose editor professes that popularity is his measure of goodness, offers a fair sample of the beliefs and tastes of the middle classes who buy it. Mr. Thackeray, after feeling his way with a dull somnambulist story called "The Portent," has in the last

\* Bohn's transl.

number come out with spiritualism in its most exaggerated shape, in a paper written by a person for whose general veracity the editor vouches, and purporting to contain the *audita et visa* of a set of philosophers during a *séance* with the celebrated Mr. Home.

I am not going to examine the evidence on which these stories are brought forward, nor do I pretend to define how much may be due to diabolic fraud, and how much to nervous excitement; though I should be loth to say that I believed the devil to have any thing whatever to do with the phenomena. I only maintain that, whether the devil is mixed up in the business or not, a Christian man ought to be ashamed of taking any part, even of feeling any great interest in the manifestations; ought to think himself defiled and degraded if he meddles with them, and to esteem them the most ignoble, contemptible, and worthless facts which ever pretended to a place within the circle of the science of human nature.

I am aware that many of the "manifestations" are described in language which recalls the miraculous portions of the lives of saints, and that some of the more mystical of our saints have been claimed by "biologists" as mere "magnetic mediums," and the phenomena of their lives have been translated into the language of spiritualism. But this fact does not in the least attract me towards these manifestations, so far as they are merely natural. The Apostle tells me in plain words that God often chooses human folly and weakness, even all that is "ignoble, contemptible, and naught," to humiliate the noble, the proud, and the great. Apart, then, from the supernatural action of divine grace, I think I have the Apostle's authority for despising these manifestations as the most vain, foolish, weak, contemptible, and worthless facts that ever challenged human interest and inquiry. Where divine grace is present, and where the Church sets her seal to its presence, I worship it, and I worship it with all the more reverence and humility because it chooses to manifest itself in what would otherwise be contemptible, for the express purpose of humiliating me. But when divine grace is not there, the contemptible alone remains. Christian mortification is one thing, the starved pride of the Indian fakeer another. The discipline and the hair-shirt of religious orders does not in the slightest degree predispose me in favour of the mutilation and self-torture of the old priests of Cybele and Baal, or the flagellations of bacchanals and orgiasts. When a man of refined intellect and life, like the ex-high-chancellor of England, St. Thomas of Canterbury, can so far sacrifice himself as to allow his hair-shirt to swarm with



vermin, I admire in this point also the noble forgetfulness of self which distinguished that hero; but I gain no more respect for dirt in the abstract. I do not suppose that any civilised man would say that a filthy skin and clothes crawling with vermin are any thing but a degradation, moral and physical, to the man whose sloth indulges in such luxuries. The devil's advocate was surely right in his sturdy opposition to the beatification of the Blessed B. Labré on these grounds. The objections were got over by the other proofs of sanctity, and even thereby turned into fresh proofs of mortification; but in their mere human aspect, before they were thus transfigured, they were simply disgusting. And even when they are glorified by holiness, the stomach heaves at them perforce. I well remember how the man who had charge of the relics in the cave of St. Lorenzo at Subiaco described the face of disgust of Pius IX., in the spring of 1847, when the point-studded shirt of the saint was shown to him, and he was told how the wounds beneath were creeping with maggots even during the man's life. So again, I would not disparage the gift of prophecy; but apart from grace, the clairvoyance and second-sight that counterfeit that gift seem to belong only to degraded natures, to be joined with the weak will of hysterical or somnambulist patients, and to be nearly allied with forms of idiocy, insanity, and varied self-delusion. It is an unfortunate and a degraded state, worthy of pity, not of wonder and admiration.

Nature comes before grace; and though in exceptional cases grace transfigures nature, and exhibits its highest forms in natural weakness, yet in general grace uses nature as it already exists. The heathen virtues did not cease to be virtues when Christianity came, though sometimes Christianity exhibited her new virtues in their freshest perfection in persons to whom the most admired pagan virtues seemed to be wanting. But St. Paul explains why this was done; the most foolish and contemptible persons and qualities were chosen, were transfigured, and informed with wisdom and strength, and were used to overcome all that the world honoured, and generally honoured with good reason, to show that God in weakness and folly is mightier than man at his strongest and wisest. But He did not thereby alter the old relations of weakness and strength, of wisdom and folly. Because weakness full of grace is stronger than graceless strength, it does not follow that graceless weakness has become as noble as strength. Weakness and folly and dirt remain truly contemptible, truly degrading, except in those

particular cases where God chooses to inform them with His grace, and to use them for His special purposes.

I think I see in our current literature many indications of the complete oblivion into which this truth has fallen. In fact, there are many minds in which it has become quite inverted. Like Solomon, they have turned to the contemplation of wisdom and folly, without arriving at Solomon's conclusion, that wisdom is as superior to folly as light to darkness. Indeed, they prefer both darkness and folly to their opposites; they grope about in the "night-side of nature" in the hope of extracting from its confusion and gloom some fresh illumination, even some fresh mental faculty. The general interest that was taken in the late religious revivals, and the judgments that sensible men formed concerning them, indicated the prevalence of the mood of mind to which I am alluding; though I must do people the justice to own that they did not profess to admire the peculiar revival manifestations for themselves, but only as evidences of a supernatural influence. They declared themselves ready to test the alleged miracle by its moral effects; but either their inveterate prejudices, or a certain critical inability, so interfered with their good intentions, that their willingness never strengthened into will, and they could never see any facts but those which they wished to see. I have no reports of the late Irish revivals by me; but the following extracts from a book published in 1694, under the title of *The Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, or the Foolishness of their Preaching discovered*, will show the relation of the revivals of the nineteenth to those of the seventeenth century, and the constant character of these manifestations. And first, that the effect depends not on the matter spoken, but on the manner of speaking it: "Such is the force that a loud voice and whining tone, in broken and smothered words, have upon the animal spirits of the Presbyterian rabble, that they look not upon a man as endowed with the Spirit of God without such canting and deformity of holiness. A person that hath the dexterity of whining may make a great congregation of them weep with an ode of Horace or eclogue of Virgil, especially if he can but drivel a little either at mouth or eyes when he repeats them. And such a person may pass for a soul-ravishing spiritualist, if he can but set off his nonsense with a wry mouth, which with them is called a *grace-pouring-down countenance*. The snuffling and twang of the nose passes for the gospel sound, and the throwings of the face for the motions of the Spirit. All they do is to affect the passions, not the judg-



ment." And this seems to me to proceed from their radical misconception of the relative value of our natural faculties and virtues, and from their theory that Christianity is to build, not upon the gold and silver of natural nobleness and goodness, but on the straw and stubble of passion and hysterical excitement. From this theory follows a sort of apotheosis of disease. I find in the book I just now quoted that one of the Scotch preachers said publicly from the pulpit, of a person who had been reduced to so desperate a condition that his hands were bound to prevent him committing suicide, as he threatened to do: "This is the best man in my parish; would to God ye were all like him! he does truly fear reprobation, which not many of you are aware of." Another, praying in public for a woman similarly troubled in spirit, said, "A wholesome disease, good Lord! a wholesome disease, Lord, for the soul! Alas, few in the land are troubled with this disease. Lord, grant that she may have many fellows in this disease!" And another preacher, whose powerful denunciations had driven some unhappy men to commit suicide, declared, "This is a plain proof that the gospel has not been preached in this parish these eight-and-twenty years; for in all that time you have not heard of one that had a tender conscience like these men; but now, when we begin again to preach the gospel, it is so powerful that it awakes men's conscience, and pricks them so at the heart that they cannot bear it nor live under it."

These revivalists, though more annoying than the spiritualists, in that they do not confine themselves to darkened rooms where you have to seek them out, but station themselves in roads and streets to thrust tracts into your hands, and go into the frequented fields and parks and commons to preach at you, are yet in some sense more respectable than the spiritualist, because they do not profess to admire these "wholesome diseases" for themselves, but as manifestations and signs of the inner state of the soul. The spiritualists stand on a different footing. For them these things are merely natural; they loudly proclaim that they have nothing to do with angel or devil; the manifestations are merely psychological, and only valuable in themselves, and not for any further end. So they run into a worse and more incurable mistake than the revivalists. The revivalists honour nervous disease because they believe it to be supernatural; if they thought it was merely natural, it would share the contempt with which they profess to regard the whole of our fallen nature. Despising the whole, they are not very particular about the parts; no one part can be better than an-

other, and none worse. But the spiritualists honour hysteria, somnambulism, nervous excitement, and mania on their own account. Even the Bostonian professor, a strong-minded man in many respects, who delivers himself of admirable sneers about phrenology and homœopathy, is weak enough to speak of cataleptical affections as "the trances that belong to the spiritual pathology of *higher natures*, mostly those of women."

It seems to me that this fancy opens the door to a whole host of delusions. Once get the notion that the mesmeric or cataleptic trance is something that belongs to a higher nature, that in itself it is superior to the ordinary operations of sensibility and reason, and we at once lose all power of testing it; the higher cannot submit to be judged by the lower. Sense has no right to question the perceptions of a faculty higher than itself, and reason is no proper arbiter of an intelligence that it cannot understand. When once I have bowed down to the idol, I have enslaved my judgment to it. I may pretend as much as I like to a sceptical habit of mind, I may fancy that I hold myself in a state of equilibrium, as a judge should do, and that I am ready to give an impartial verdict; but, in reality, I have given my verdict already, directly I have referred these spiritualistic phenomena to a "higher nature."

The materialism of men of science must necessarily result in this exaggerated respect for the anormal and unregulated parts of our nature. Disbelieving in the separate soul, in the immortal spirit made after the image of God, and in the immaterial will and conscience, they can only recognise the results of organisation in all mental phenomena, and they have no test whereby they can distinguish their respective values, except the apparent delicacy of the organs on which they depend. For them the nervous system is the most important tissue in the body; and the manifestations of the most highly exalted nervous system, as they are unquestionably the most startling phenomena of life, begin to be considered the highest aim, the *summum bonum* of man. Miss Martineau expressly declares that she believes the mesmeric trance to be the highest bliss of which a human being is capable. Idiots and imbeciles are objects of respect in many rude and religious populations, Christian, Mahometan, and heathen. But that is because the simple-minded people think that the minds of the unfortunates are in a continual ecstasy, and that they can dwell in the Divine presence; but spiritualists believe in no such supernatural employment of the ecstatic soul. And yet they seek this trance for its own sake, in spite of the manifest



weakening of all the mental powers which is its physical result, and the deep degradation that is its moral consequence.

There is a department of spiritualism to which these observations do not seem at first sight to apply; I mean, that which its votaries would place in the category of facts, to be determined, like all other facts, by the common rules of observation and experience. Such facts are those which we are called upon, not to believe, but to suspend our judgment about, in the article in the *Cornhill Magazine* to which I have referred. But here also I find the very pretensions which I have already combated. I am told that these spirit-rapping manifestations are things which "go beyond the precincts of our present intelligence;" as if the writer expected that they would add a fresh sense to our mind, or a fresh syllogistic figure beyond *barbara* or *baroko* to our reasonings.

I have reason to believe that the whole account of the *séance* with Mr. Home in the *Cornhill Magazine* has had the effect of increasing the scepticism of the most capable of the Catholics with whom I am acquainted. I know of persons who have seen Mr. Home's performances, and were doubtful before, whose doubts have been confirmed by the article in the *Cornhill Magazine*. There is so much of nervous excitement about the narrator, so much that shows that he and the rest of the party were obliged to manipulate their nerves and to exalt their fancies before the manifestations would occur, that I own myself disposed to consider the competency of the witness, if not his honesty, sincerity, and veracity, to be seriously compromised. The darkening of the room, only varied by the pale light of a curtained window and the flickering of an expiring fire; the "stillness of expectation," "so profound that for all the sounds of life that were heard it might have been an empty chamber"—are elements of nervous delusion that it requires a good deal of care to correct. We all know what it is to wait for a clock striking,—the way in which the minutes lengthen out, and seem as if they would never end, till at last the first stroke of the bell quite startles and surprises us. If the mere waiting for such a common phenomenon so affects us, the case becomes more serious when we are waiting for we know not what,—when in the dead of night we are listening for burglars, or for the crackling of fire,—when

"The house-beams moan,  
And a step unknown  
Is surmised on the garret-stairs."

But thieves and fire are quite eclipsed by events beyond all known laws of nature, like these preternatural manifesta-

tions. I can scarcely realise the tension of nerves which the expectation of their coming would cause. The Bostonian professor has some remarks which apply by analogy to this case: "Just keep your ears open any time after midnight, when you are lying in bed in a lone attic of a dark night. What horrid, strange, suggestive, unaccountable noises you will hear!" Then he goes on to enumerate the fancies "that make your heart roll over and tumble about, so that it feels more like a live rat under your ribs than a part of your own body;" then follows a crash of something, and "you are damp and cold, and sitting bolt upright, and the bed trembling so that the death-watch is frightened and has stopped ticking." I cannot help thinking that this is something like the state which all the company at one of these *séances* try to get into—a state in which the beating of one's own heart may be mistaken for the thumping of a pavior, one's own breathing for the whistle of a steam-engine, and when the tremulous shapes formed by the pulsations in the veins of the eyes gain for a moment a consistency that seems quite objective. But manifestly no sane man would put himself into such a state, if he wished to be a faithful observer and recorder of facts. And the testimony of a body of men in this state, who also hold the theory that it is a high condition of human development, so that they are less on their guard against the delusions which it so easily induces, seems to me to be not worth much more than the testimony of a number of the inmates of a Bedlam to the objective reality of their hallucinations. All of us have the elements of insanity in our brains; in our dreams we are stark mad; but Providence puts on a strait-waistcoat when it removes all power of voluntary locomotion. To believe our waking dreams is not to cure our madness, but to reject our strait-waistcoat and our padded room. He that trusted implicitly to his dreams, who lived in his night-world instead of his day-world, would be certainly mad. I cannot say that I think very differently of the man who lives in the strange world of Mr. Home's *séances*.

In the midst of this nervous tension, after the excited ear had been gathering a wild air full of strange transitions from the noise of an automatic accordion, which had the goodness to exhibit its powers in the dark, Mr. Home, who was seated before the darkened window, said in a quiet voice, "My chair is moving; I am off the ground; don't notice me; talk of something else;" and they all saw him, or thought they saw him, lifted into the air. When he was there, they could not see him; but he described his position: "He told



us he was going to pass across the window, against the gray silvery light of which he would be visible. We watched in profound stillness, and saw his figure pass from one side of the window to the other, feet foremost, lying horizontally in the air." (He had before told them that he was in a horizontal position.) "He spoke to us as he passed, and told us that he would turn the reverse way, and recross the window; which he did." It is a fact, I believe, that in some kinds of mesmeric trance the patient sees all that the agent tells him to see; any way, the conditions of this particular example are too suspicious to justify any man in changing his mode of thinking concerning the whole matter, and in beginning to put faith in what all daylight experience declares to be either a delusion or a trick. The appeal to the omnipotence of testimony to prove any thing is out of place when the competency of the witnesses is questioned. If we are to believe all that we are told, and all that we can find respectable men to avouch, we must say good night to reason. "Every human proposition," says Sir Walter Raleigh, "hath equal authority, if reason make no difference:" but reason will make a difference in spite of the self-assertion of the most positive witnesses.

I hope that your readers will not misunderstand my object. I neither deny the possibility of the facts as miraculous, nor the possible agency of the devil in them; but I think we have too much overlooked the hallucinations inseparable from a high state of nervous tension, and the influence which the opinion that this state is a noble and high state of existence must have on the reverence with which such hallucinations may be received. He who believes theoretically that dreams are communicated by angels, will trust his dreams; he who believes that a state of nervous tension is the highest condition of human nature, will be slow to doubt of the reality of the revelations which he receives in this state. On the other hand, the man who sees the image of God in the human free will and the human reason, but in the nervous irritability, the dreams, the passions, and bodily movements of man only the image of the beasts, will be very slow to degrade himself so far as to take any special or practical interest in the development of these animal powers, especially when their development is found to have the most deleterious effect upon both body and mind.

---

A TRUE REPORT OF THE LIFE AND MARTYRDOM  
OF MR. RICHARD WHITE, SCHOOLMASTER.

AFTER that the council had proved these happy men, and found in them no refuse metal, but pure gold, they sent them towards their own country again, with the like pomp wherewith they were brought thence before, *Christi Gal. vi. signata in corpore ferentes* ("Bearing the marks of Christ Jesus in their bodies"). Thus it pleased God by the weak to confound the strong, and by the simple to overcome the prudent; for whereas their adversaries purposed through tortures to increase their own credit, and to quench the faith of these blessed confessors, behold their tortures turned to the foil of the enemy, to the eternal praise of the men afflicted, to the honour of God, and to the good example of their dear country. *A Domino factum est istud et est mirabile in oculis nostris. Psalm 117.*

The seventh assize. And being now returned home, at the first assize they had nothing said unto them, but two of the witnesses were bound to appear at the next assize following, to bear evidence against them as they should be instructed. At which time three of the prisoners were arraigned in manner and form following.

The eighth assize kept at Wrexham, wherein Mr. White was condemned. The arraignment of Mr. Richard White, John Hughes, and Robert Moris, at Wrexham in Denbighshire, upon Friday, being the 9th of October, and the feast of St. Denis, anno Dom. 1584, Sir George Bromley, Chief Justice; Simon Thelwall, Deputy Justice; Piers Owen, Sheriff of the Shire; Dr. Ellis, Roger Puleston, Jevan' Lloyd of Yale, and Owen Brereton, with others, assistants.

As the prisoners were coming to the bar, Mr. White in the way before all the assembly blessed himself, whereat a young gentleman there present made no little pastime, often crossing his body in derision, and casting withal mocks and mowes with his head and mouth towards the poor man: but scornful youth is to be borne with; for he had forgotten that the same holy sign of the cross which he scorned was made on his forehead when he was christened, and he had not read that *Matt. 25.* Christ foreshowed it would appear one day before all the world in glory, at which time he shall be forced to behold it unto his everlasting confusion, if he do not prevent

Francis Bromley.

See the Communion Book.



here God's wrath by daily penance. With like scorn he and his fellows derided the good man's answers to the judges, namely, when he said in Latin, *Christianus sum* ("I am a Christian"); a thing to be lamented with tears of blood, and a matter for the posterity to marvel at, that men bearing the names of Christians could grow to such impiety and height of paganism as to sport at their own profession.

The prisoners, now standing before the bar, first were commanded to hold up their hands; then the pronotary informed them that they stood indicted of high treason, and that they should have their trial. And so he read the bill of their indictment, viz. that they had offended against the statutes of supremacy and persuasion; hereupon the judges demanded, how they would be tried. To the which demand Mr. White answered in the name of himself and his fellows, "We will be tried by you, who are the justices of the bench; for you are wise and learned, and better able to discern the equity of our cause than the simple men of our own country, altogether unacquainted with such matters." But their desire taking no place, a jury was impannelled, and the witnesses examined, Lewis Gronow, Edward Erles, Howell David. Gronow deposed that the said three prisoners were in hand with him on a Sunday in July an. Dom. 1582, to become a Papist; secondly, that he heard them also to acknowledge the Bishop of Rome to be supreme head of the Church; thirdly, that he heard Richard White in plain terms to affirm the Pope now living to have the same authority which Christ gave unto Peter.

Gronow's deposition against the three prisoners.

Erles deposed that he heard White rehearse certain rhymes of his own making against married priests and ministers; secondly, that he called the Bible a bubble; thirdly, that he termed Justice Bromley, *ustus y fram*; and fourthly, that he defended the Pope's supremacy.

Erles, his deposition against White only.

Howell David, against Mr. White, deposed that he heard him complain of this world; and secondly, affirm that it would not last long; thirdly, that he hoped to see a better world; and fourthly, that he confessed the Pope's supremacy.

Howell David, his deposition against Mr. White.

The said Howell David deposed against his cousin John Hughes, that meeting with him at a place called Rhud y Ceirw, in Ruabon parish, he sought to persuade him unto the Roman religion, adding the churches of Protestants to be full of wicked spirits and the Pope supreme head of the Catholic Church;

Howell David, his deposition against John Hughes.

moreover, that he sent one John Griffith, a priest, unto him after this conference between them, who tendered to bind him by oath unto his Roman faith. And all this talk both the prisoners denied not to have been, before their apprehensions.

Thus the examination of the witnesses being received, the judges demanded of the prisoners what they had to say against the evidence for their own defence; the prisoners took exception against the witnesses, and with many circumstances showed their depositions not to be allowed. That Lewis Gronow had been on the pillory for perjury by the procurement of Mr. Tudur Probert, and was not therefore to be admitted as a lawful witness, referring themselves for the truth of this matter to the knowledge of Mr. Simon Thelwall himself. Thelwall answered, if he had committed perjury, he hath had his punishment; it may be he telleth truth in this point. John Hughes his speeches to the justice were these. "Now they have made an end, Mr. Justice, and said what they can against us, I trust we shall be also heard what we can say for ourselves. I am able to prove that two of these witnesses have been bribed to bear false evidence against us;" whereat Thelwall started, saying, "What, what dost thou say? that they have been bribed?"

*Hughes.* And am able to prove it.

*Thelwall.* How much had they?

*H.* Thirty-two shillings.

*T.* Who gave it them?

*H.* They had it.

*T.* How canst thou prove it?

*H.* Mr. John Wynne ap William Madock Goch, a gentleman of this parish, told my fellows and me, that one Peter Royden, entering into speech of us, informed him how Lewis Gronow and Ed. Erles received xvis. a piece to bear this false witness; and that Royden himself was offered xvis., but he refused it.

The gentleman was called before the bar and deposed, the prisoners' report declared unto him, the which he reiterating before all the hall justified to be true; whereat the assembly were greatly astonished, and the judges themselves not a little daunted. Nevertheless, having before laid down the plot, whom they purposed to kill and whom to save, it was not for their purpose to yield unto the truth; but they went to cast a mist over the eyes

An impudent lie.

The prisoners were found guilty in the statute of persuasion before it was devised many years.

A simple evasion.

This money was given by Jevan Lloyd of Yale the year he was Sheriff, but he knew not that so much money should be paid for his own grave.

But alas, by this it is



of the inquest, that they might not see their legerdemain ; for Thelwall, turning to the jury, answered the gentleman's deposition in these words.

clear their malice to be without excuse.

“It is not likely that any man should give any money to bear witness against them ; for what advantage should any man have by their deaths ? As touching Howell David, his reward was not with the least ; for he had the benefit of a bond of two hundred pounds, which he had forfeited to his cousin John

A sorry shift to avoid so evident a proof.

Hughes ; he had also his lands from him, by the friendship of Sir George Bromley, who in consideration of this his good service denied the prisoner justice and law against him.” The words that the poor afflicted man used to the justice concerning the said Howell his cousin were these : This man hath taken away my house and lands from me and my children, beside all law and conscience, and now he seeketh my life and blood ; (I appeal to you, Mr. Justice,) whether he be an indifferent witness against me ; moreover, he committed perjury in deposing before the council that I did not receive one pennyworth of harm by him at what time he kept forcible possession in my house, whereas I can prove that he and his people consumed divers gallons of butter and cheeses of mine, and spoiled me of a blanket and other stuff ; and Mr. Jevan Lloyd of Yale, there sitting, knoweth well what man of conversation Howell David is, and hath been, and as I am certain that he hath forged these matters against me, so may I also take upon my soul that he believeth Mr. Griffith, for it is well known that Catholic priests do not use to tender oaths unto any person to be of their religion.

And thus this part of the tragedy finished.

The prisoners, excepting against the witnesses (as is before declared), denied the evidence to be true ; “Therefore, Mr. Justice (said the prisoners), we beseech you to consider that we are falsely accused by foresworn men, borne to that purpose ;” whereunto Thelwall answered, “Well, well, you are likely to feel the smart of it ;” and so turning to the jury he read the statute of persuasion, repeating often such words as seemed to make against the prisoners ; then preparing himself to give the charge, as a preamble he discoursed before upon the evidence, extolling the witnesses, dispraising the prisoners, Mr. White by name, remembering in particular his behaviour at a sermon in the church, and another sermon before the bar, where he and his fellows stamped with their feet, and because their stubbornness might appear more manifestly to the inquest, Mr. Thelwall demanded of them

A charitable answer of a judge.

A greedy blood-sucker.

such questions as he knew they could not answer with safe conscience affirmatively. The first question was, whether they would come to the church; the prisoners answered that they were in the Catholic Church, and from thence would not be removed; the second, whether the Queen ought to be

This is not to find them guilty, but by hook and by crook to cast them.

This Dr. Ellis is a fit man to sit in judgment upon the servants of God, who is known to be of as profane a life as any in the world.

supreme head of the Church; and turning to Mr. White, urged him to answer plainly and to utter his conscience; the prisoner acknowledged to the Queen as much authority as Edward the Confessor and Queen Mary had. Dr. Ellis replied,

"There is no reason, White, but thou shouldst confess the Queen head of the Church within her own dominions." He answered that he did acknowledge her to have as much authority as his father and elders did grant to their princes, and withal he asked Mr. Dr. in Latin, *quid est ecclesia?* The which question being a deep point of divinity, and besides his profession was too high for Mr. Dr. his capacity. Here Mr. White was charged by some of the company to have spoken words to Lewis Gronow

his accuser, directly approving the Pope's supremacy, viz. that he affirmed Christ to have twelve Apostles, and that of them He chose one to be head, whom He named Peter; that unto him He gave power to bind and to loose, and in him to his successors: the prisoner answered that these were not his words, but St. Chrysostom's. John Hughes likewise, to this question of the supremacy, said in effect as his fellow had done before him; and Robert Moris being demanded also this point, answered that this question was to be learned in schools by divinity, and not before the bar by compulsion or penal statutes. Mr. Thelwall demanded again, what if the Pope came with a power to invade the realm, and to fight against the Queen, whose part would he take? Moris answered that he was well assured that the Pope would not come to fight against the Queen. Then Mr. Thelwall, having wrested from these men so much treason as would serve his turn to despatch them, turned to the jury and said, "Now you may see the stubbornness of these fellows; demand what you will, they will answer nothing directly; it standeth the Queen upon to look unto such lewd companions as these are and their like, for by such kind of people the Queen and the realm have been divers times in danger." And

A fine sleight to deceive the poor jury.

so he roved over the insurrection in the north, the excommunication of Pius V., Story and Felton, Dr. Saunders's coming into Ireland, Campion and his fellows, Arden and Sommerfield, Francis Throck-



morton ; aggravating the prisoners to be of one religion with the persons before named and recited. At the upshot of this conflict the poor men requested the jury, for the love of God and safeguard of their own souls, to have regard unto their consciences ; and Mr. White said, "For my part, I have as much wrong as any can have, and am as guiltless of this indictment as any here, I take God to witness." Hughes also said, "Judge you whether I would make my cousin Howell David privy to any secret matter, and especially touching my life, for we have been at variance about lands this ten years and above. Yonder are sitting on the bench Mr. Puleston and Mr. Jevan Lloyd of Yale, who do know this to be true. And moreover, they know what truth and honesty is in the said Howell my cousin, therefore, I beseech you to consider of him." But the gentlemen held their peace. Furthermore he said to the jury, "Demand of the judges whether their commission be to hang us, because we refuse to go to church, and to answer to the question of the supremacy, and then find us guilty according to your law ; or else, for the love of God, weigh and consider of the witnesses what manner of men they be, and how falsely they have foresworn themselves ; have regard unto your consciences for the safeguard of your own souls, or else our blood shall be required at your hands." Finally, Moris protested, saying, "I take God to witness, I call heaven and earth to record, I appeal unto the last day of judgment, that I am as innocent of this indictment as the child that was born yesternight. Lay, therefore, God's fear before your eyes, for we are not so much afraid of our own lives as we are careful for your souls."

Note here  
their  
wise induction  
to  
prove them  
traitors.

Both these  
gentlemen  
do know by  
this day  
what offence  
it is before  
God to  
keep  
silence,  
when the  
innocent  
should be  
defended.

Here Mr. Justice Bromley appointed the pronotary to read the commission from the privy council, to the which had subscribed Sir Thomas Bromley, lord chancellor ; Sir Harry Sydney, lord president of the Marches ; Sir Francis Walsingham, the Queen's principal secretary ; Sir James Crests, and others. In the end, being ready to dismiss the jury, both judges gave them a new charge again, terrifying the simple men with the sight of the commission from the higher powers. So the jury departed to the church, where they remained all the night following with their keeper, saving that two of them, about an hour after their coming, were sent for to confer with the judges, to know of them whom they should acquit and whom they should find guilty, as it is reported. The next day after, being Saturday, about

eight of the clock in the morning, they returned with their verdict, and found Mr. Richard White and John Hughes guilty of felony and treason; but Robert Moris they dis-

See their  
indiffer-  
ency.

charged; whereupon Mr. Thelwall said that some favour was showed Moris although he deserved none, being no less guilty than the rest. Marry, the prisoner took it for no favour to be separated from his dear companions, the faithful confessors of Jesus Christ, for he made great lamentation and wept bitterly in the sight of the whole court, saying, "The worse luck I;" whereby assuredly God's holy name was glorified in him, the Catholic religion honoured, many of the audience confirmed by his example, and the justice of God satisfied for the offence he had committed in his manacles, by the compulsion of those men before whom he was now arraigned. Finally, as Mr. Thelwall was ready to give the judgment (for Sir George

For shame.

Bromley could not find in his heart to sit himself that day), John Hughes said, "Come, let us have it; we are as ready to die for our consciences as you are to pronounce judgment against us." So the justice commanded the clerk of the assize to lay down that Moris was acquitted and Hughes reprieved. Then he turned to Mr. White, and said as followeth, "Richard White, thou art accused of treason and found guilty by the country; what hast thou to say why thou mayest not die according to the laws of the realm?" "If I had (said Mr. White) I should not be heard, do you make of it what you will; only this I say, that I am no more guilty than you are a true Christian man; and if I be a traitor, your father and grandfather, and yourself, in Queen Mary's time were traitors." But Mr. Thelwall regarding little the prisoner's words, proceeded to the sentence in this manner

A cruel  
sentence.

following: "Richard White shall be brought to prison from whence he came, and thence drawn on a hurdle to the place of execution, where he shall hang half dead, and so be cut down alive, his members cast into the fire, his belly ripped into the breast, his bowels, liver, lungs, heart, &c. thrown likewise into the fire, his head cut off, his body parted into four quarters. Finally, head and quarters to be set up where it shall please the Queen. And this execution to be done on a Thursday; we will appoint you the day before we go. And so the Lord have mercy upon him."

At which sentence the condemned person was nothing dismayed, neither changed countenance, but resolutely gave answer saying, "What is all this? Is it any more than one death?" After this good work was brought to an end, Mr. Thelwall said to Robert Moris, "Thou art here indicted for



abstaining from the church the space of twenty-seven months, contrary to the peace of the Queen's majesty, her crown, and dignity. What sayest thou, art thou guilty?" Moris answered, "I cannot deny but the bill is true, marry, I have been in prison all the while and before." Thelwall replied, "Thou mightest have had leave to go into the church if thou hadst been willing."

"I might have bought that better cheap five years ago."

"Hast thou money to pay the Queen?"

"I hope her majesty hath no need of my money; and if I had money, I would be more willing to pay it than to lie in prison as I do."

"Wilt thou now go to church?"

"No; I do not fear your gallows so much as I did your tortures;" at which words Mr. Thelwall started as if he had been stung with a wasp, and in great rage said that if such stubborn fellows as he was were cut off it were no great matter. And so he charged him in a fine of five hundred and forty pounds, charging the sheriff to look well unto him, as he would answer the fine at his own peril.

Last of all, the wives of the two condemned persons appeared, carrying on their arms two little infants, whom Mr. Thelwall solicited in courteous manner to reform themselves, and not to follow the ways of their disobedient husbands. But the wives refused to follow his counsel; and Mr. White's wife said unto him, "If you lack blood, you may take my life as well as my husband's; and if you will give the witnesses a little bribe, you may call them; they will bear evidence against me as well as they did against him." But the poor woman was quickly commanded to silence, and together with her companion committed to the gaol, where they made no long abode, for the pitiful gentleman before his departure, upon better advisement, took sureties of them for their appearance another day, and so turned them loose whiles he went about to hang their husbands; and thus ended this day's action. The which was the last day of appearance unto our blessed confessor in this world, and the eighth assize in number from the beginning of his imprisonment—a number mystical in Holy Scripture, as St. Augustine noteth: *Septem sunt* (saith he) *quæ perficiunt, octavus clarificat, et quod perfectum est demonstrat* ("The number of seven doth make perfect, the number of eight clarifieth, and sheweth the perfection of the rest"). For in this eighth assize appeared to the world

Moris.

Thelwall: a wise question.

Moris: a fit answer.

Thelwall.

Moris: a constant answer.

Aug. lib. 1,  
de sermone  
Do. in  
monte.

how much the good man had profited in the school of Christ, and what perfection continual patience can work in a resolute soul; who, notwithstanding his intolerable calamity, behaved himself all the time of his arraignment so pleasantly that he moved the people sundry times to laughter, an evident argument of his guiltless conscience, either towards his prince or country.

At his first coming to the bar, Lewis Gronow was asked whether he knew the prisoners; to the which question the disciple of Judas, answering in the Welsh tongue, said, *Adwen yn dda*, that is to say, "I know them well." Mr. White replied, *A nineath adwenon dithe yn ddrwg* ("And we know thee bad"); whereat the company laughed, because of the equivocation those two words ('good' and 'bad') have in that language. At the same time some of the assistants, perceiving the said Gronow to be hard of hearing, desired Mr. Justice to speak louder unto him; the prisoner answered, he should better hear than any in that assembly, having so many holes in his ears. And when the jury brought in their verdict finding him guilty of that felony and treason whereof they were in their hearts as guilty themselves, he said, *Non audent aliter dicere propter metum Judæorum* ("They dare not otherwise say for fear of the Jews"), alluding to a place in the Gospel of certain fearful disciples that durst not openly profess their belief in Christ. Many other like speeches he had this while to the inquest and others, the which for brevity I omit; and so he continued to the last breath, that his own fellows reported they never knew him more pleasantly disposed than he was after his condemnation. And the very day of his execution, understanding that the executioner was in hand to bargain the doublet he had on his back, he changed it for a worse that one of his fellows gave him, and told the company how he had deceived the hangman; yea, at the hour of his death, as the executioner was putting the rope about his neck, he smiled and said, "Good William, I would advise thee to leave off this occupation; use it not much, for it is but a simple office;" so little was this resolute man daunted with the fear of death, of whose cup he was sure presently to taste. But I stay too long in these merry conceits, having so lamentable a matter in hand of greater importance concerning this blessed confessor, especially considering that I must over-pass many things in particular, as his behaviour and speeches to his fellows after his condemnation, to his wife, to the ministers, and others, which would require a large volume; and I see this rude treatise is waxen already larger than I purposed at the beginning. Likewise, taking



the cloth in his hands wherewith his eyes should have been covered, he lapped it about his head, and perceiving that it was not well, he called to the hangman for help, and smiling, said, "Put it on, William, as thou art accustomed to others; thou knowest better than I, for I am not very skilful in this occupation." Another merry proceeding was at his first coming to the bar, after that his trial was referred to a jury. Sir George Bromley, for a show of justice and indifferency, commanded the sheriff to return a substantial jury to pass upon him and his fellows, who accordingly returned William Almar, Esq., to be the foreman, and all the rest men of worship and credit, which being called, not one of them would appear, although they were threatened to be fined in a 10*l.* a piece; the which Mr. Justice perceiving, he charged the sheriff to return a *tales de circumstantibus*, which is another jury of such as were present in the hall. And so he returned John Rogers to be foreman, a bankrupt who had sold and mortgaged all his lands, and the rest of the jury simple fellows of small value and less credit. But when Mr. White saw what poor company they were, he said with a loud voice, "Is this your *tales*?" (making as if he had not known what the word *tales* did mean until he saw the jury appear); and then he said, "This is indeed a *tales*, *quales non est in Wales*, neque usque ad *cales*;" which moved the hall to laughter, whereat Sir George being offended, said very churlishly, "A little more of your Latin will cost your hanging." Now to our matter.

Of Brintanor: was drowned.

*The Martyrdom of Mr. Richard White, upon Thursday after his condemnation, being the 15th of Oct. anno Dom. 1584.*

Now the servant of Christ, having passed through many calamities, and drawing towards an end of all his sorrows, was, together with his fellows or companions, the space of ten days before his death, viz. from the first day of the assize to the time of his execution, coupled fast and chained with an huge iron chain and horse-lock, and warded diligently day and night with a band of men. The which cruelty he took to be a preface to death, and a plain warning to make himself ready. The Tuesday before his execution, a gentleman in the sheriff's name offered to discharge him of all his troubles if he would acknowledge the Queen supreme head of the Church within her own dominions; but the man being constant, refused to purchase his own liberty so dear; and the same day, being ready to meat, he called for his knife, telling the gaoler how he needed be so scrupulous as to keep his weapon from him, as though he

Tuesday.

feared lest he should spill himself, being offered his life if he would recant his religion.

Wednes-  
day.

The Wednesday following he had provided two dozen of silk points, the which he blessed and kissed one after another, appointing his wife to bestow the one dozen (which was of colour white, answerable to his name) upon twelve priests, and the other dozen upon twelve gentlemen to whom he was greatly beholden. Then he bended a single penny and blessed, &c., to be delivered his ghostly father, to whom he was beholden himself; lastly, he caused his garters to be given two priests of his familiar acquaintance; and the day before he had sent his signet or seal of brass off his finger to a gentleman his very familiar friend. All the which tokens the said parties do keep reverently, as a treasure in value more worth than thousands of gold and silver, assured monuments of the good will he bare them in this world, and pledges of the care he would take over them in heaven.

Thursday;  
the day of  
his execu-  
tion.

The Thursday morning his wife, espying David Edwards the mercer to pass by the gaol, moved at the sight of him, said, "God be a righteous judge between thee and me." But Mr. White understanding the matter, rebuked her, saying that if they did not forgive now freely all their labours would be lost.

About ten of the clock in the morning, the time approaching wherein he must taste with Christ of his last draught, the gaoler came to separate the prisoners and to set them at some liberty. This while, Mr. White hearing a great noise in the backside of the gaol, demanded what it was; and being told that the gaoler's wife made lamentation for him, he turned to his wife and said, "I pray thee, Catharine, go and comfort her." Coming down the stairs to the common gaol, he found the house full of people weeping and lamenting, among whom were divers children, on whose heads one after another laying his hands, he prayed God to bless them; then beholding a number without the gaol, attending opportunity to bid him farewell, he reached them his hands out of the window, and so took his leave of them all; the like he did also with many in the gaol; and whereas one of them, a gentleman who had formerly been his scholar, made great lamentations, he comforted him in these words: "Weep not for me, for I do but pay the rent before the rent-day." Last of all, he bestowed five shillings in small pieces of silver to the poor at the prison-door, the which money a Catholic had sent him to be distributed with his own hands. At his passing to the execution, he gave his wife eleven shil-



lings and his beads, the which was in effect all the wealth he left her. And so, being disburdened of worldly cares, all his care was for heavenly joys, whither the happy soul made haste, groaning with St. Paul to be loosed from the lump of clay, and thirsting with the holy prophet to be with God, the fountain of life—as the hart, when she is chased, thirsteth after the fountain of water. The hour at length drawing on wherein God had ordained to render unto His good and faithful servant a just reward of all his labours, the sheriff being then entered into the gaol, said, “White, make thee ready; and you women” (meaning his wife and John Hughes’s wife), “if you have taken your leave depart, and let him prepare himself to die.” The prisoner answered, “Good Mr. Sheriff, have patience awhile, and I will despatch out of hand;” and so he kissed the wives and blessed his little infant (who was not above one month old), making a cross in his forehead. Here his two companions requested Mr. Sheriff to see the execution, but it would not be granted; whereupon they kneeled down, and the wives together with them, for his benediction. The martyr, pointing with his hand unto them, desired God to stand with them; and so went toward the stade which was provided for him instead of a hurdle, saying, “In the name of Jesus,” as he went out of the prison-door. When he was come to the place, he blessed himself; then his arms were tied behind his back, and so the man of God was laid on the stade before named, and drawn through the town to the place of execution, leaving behind him in the gaol his wife and little child, therein declaring himself to be the true disciple of Christ, who had laid a law before in the Gospel that, if any man come unto Him, and did not hate his father and mother and wife and children and brother and sister, yea, and his own life too, he could not be His disciple. All the way along as he was drawn, he said the rosary, using the end of a string wherewith he held up his irons instead of beads. And that the merits of so holy a man might appear to the world, God vouchsafed to honour his death by a manifest sign; for the elements being clear and the weather dry all that morning, as soon as he was laid on the hurdle the sky waxed cloudy over the town that he suffered in, and a shower of rain poured down abundantly until body and soul were parted, at which instant incontinently the rain ceased. Whereby appeareth that the death of His saints is precious in our Lord’s sight, and the promise made in Holy Scripture performed too, in that the elements should fight for His servants against senseless people. For

Phil. i.

Psalms xli.

Piers Owen.

Luce. xii.

the truth hereof I refer me to all those who were present that day at this pitiful spectacle, who never ceased long after to talk of the strange event. Finally, the servant of God being come to an end of his journey, first the sheriff caused a proclamation to be made (as the custom is) that none should approach near the gallows. His arms were loosed, wherewith he turned to the people, and said, "God is merciful unto us; behold the elements shed tears for our sins." After this the gaoler caused him to climb up the ladder, and the executioner kneeled to ask him forgiveness. The martyr gave answer, "I do forgive thee before God, and I wish thee no more harm than I wish mine own heart." This while the sheriff and Owen Brereton whispered together, and first Owen Brereton demanded of him whether he would have a priest. The prisoner answered, "Yea, with all my heart; but I will have no minister." "White," said the sheriff, "thou hast committed heinous treason against the Queen's majesty, the which hath brought thee to this end. Art thou sorry for the same, and dost thou ask her forgiveness?" Mr. White answered, "I never committed any treasons against her more than your father and grandfather have done, unless it be a treason to fast and to pray." Owen Brereton replied, "Yes, that thou hast; for they have been manifestly proved against thee in open court." The prisoner gave answer, "Well, I pray God forgive the witnesses who foresware themselves against me; and I pray God forgive you, Mr. Brereton, for I never gave cause that you should be so mine enemy." "It is true," said Mr. Brereton, "thou never gavest me cause; but for that thou hast been an ill member of the commonwealth, and not worthy to live." Last of all, the Vicar of Wrexham spake: "Dost thou acknowledge the Queen to be supreme head of the Church?" The prisoner answered, "I acknowledge her to be lawful Queen of England, and otherwise I never said; and I beseech you all to bear witness hereof, that they belie me not when I am dead." Sonlley replied, "Why wouldst thou not confess so much before the bar?" Mr. White said, "The question was not asked me; but I told the council at another time that I was her poor subject, and that I prayed for her majesty. Mine examinations are to be seen, and my hand to the same; search the records, and you shall find this to be true. Moreover, that I offered to go out of the realm to pleasure them, or into rocks and deserts, yea, if it were possible, under the ground, to use my conscience in the least offensive manner I might, or into what place soever it would please my prince to send me; but nothing will serve." Again,

Sir Hugh  
Sonlley.



Sonlley demanded whether he would forgive David Edwards, his apprehender. He gave answer, "Yes, with all my heart, I pray God forgive him, and grant that we may both meet in heaven. I forgive also his wife, and all those who were any way guilty of my death; and I desire all the world to forgive me, and you who are here present to pray for me, and especial all those who are members of the Catholic Church, whereof the Pope is the head; and to bear me witness that I die in the old Catholic faith, and that I am innocent of all treasons wherewith I have been charged by perjured persons, the which I take upon my death." "Well, well," said the sheriff, "no more of that. Despatch, hangman." Here the company kneeled to pray for him; and prayed himself all the while; then turning to the people, he spake again, saying, "My dear countrymen, I beseech you for God's sake to have regard unto your souls, and to reconcile yourselves unto the Catholic Church; for I fear you are led astray unto everlasting damnation, except you take heed betimes. Remember your souls, and lose not that for this vile transitory muck which Christ hath so dearly bought. This is but one hour's pain to me, and what is that in respect of the torments in hell, which shall never have an end!" Thus he continued his speech a long while, repeating the same over twice or thrice, until the sheriff and others, being offended with his talk, commanded the executioner to climb up the ladder and to despatch him; who preparing himself to execute their bloody wills, asked the prisoner forgiveness the second time; whereupon the martyr, taking him by the hand, kissed it, saying, "I do forgive thee with all my heart; God and our Blessed Lady and St. Michael forgive thee; it is all one to me that thou do this deed as another." Finally, as the executioner offered to put the rope about his neck, he smiled, advising him to leave the occupation, for it was but simple; again he smiled as he went to cover his own face with a cloth and could not. He called to the hangman for help, telling him that he was not cunning in the occupation, the which as he was in doing, the prisoner requested him to deliver the kerchief to his poor wife, although he demanded double the price. So the executioner came down, and the sheriff commanded the gaoler to bid him turn the ladder; at which words Mr. White lifted up the kerchief, and said, "I have been a jesting fellow, and if I have offended any that way, or by my songs, I beseech them for God's sake to forgive me." In the end, as he was

Here he falleth of his own accord to those treasons whereof his adversaries made such ado to prove him guilty.

This blind country cannot say hereafter but it had sufficient warning.

saying the prayer of the publican, *Deus propitius esto mihi peccatori* ("O God, be merciful to me a sinner"), the executioner turned the ladder, and so he hanged awhile, knocking his breast continually with both hands until his senses were taken from him. In the mean time the hangman

He suffered  
in his fet-  
ters.

leaned upon his shackles of purpose to despatch him out of his pains the sooner; but the sheriff, doubting he should die too soon, commanded to cut him down. At which words the people desired him to take compassion upon the poor prisoner and to let him die, the same also two or three gentlemen which were present requested, by whose earnest entreaty he was stayed yet a little longer. In the end the rope was cut, and the prisoner carried to the hurdle, on the which being laid along, as the executioner was busy to remove the irons and to cut off his members, the man revived and recovered his senses again. And although thieves and murderers were well acquainted with the hangman's office, yet he wanted skill to do this execution answerable to the bloody wills of the magistrates, by reason of which he put the martyr to double pains, and exceeded in cruelty the bloody sentence pronounced against him. For, having made a little hole in his belly, he pulled out of the same his bowels by piecemeal; the which device taking no good success, he mangled his breast with a butcher's axe to the very chine, most pitifully; then tearing his entrails, he threw them into the fire before his face, whereat the servant of God never shrunk, nor once showed any sign of impatience, but still continued knocking his breast, until the sheriff's men held his arms back by force. Finally, being ready to lift up the last gasp, he lifted up his head and shoulders over the hurdle, and beholding so cruel a slaughter, he said in the Welsh tongue, "O Duw gwyn pybeth y diw hun," *i. e.* "O good God, what is this?" The gaoler answered, "It is an execution for the Queen's majesty;" whereunto the martyr replied, saying, "Jesus, have mercy upon me!" and so at the striking off his head he died.

He dieth.

If it may be called a death, and not rather a change into a better life to die for Christ, a happy change from the temporal calamities of this world to the eternal joys of heaven,—from sorrow and pain to rest and solace, from weeping to singing, from misery unto felicity, from the company of sinful men to be conversant with saints and angels, from the sight of the gallows, of the burning fire, of the boiling pan, of the bloody axe, of the cruel hangman, to the sight of God, who now with His own holy hands wipeth away all tears from his eyes, who now rewardeth His good



and faithful servant with a crown of life (the case of all martyrs), for his constant faith; a crown of justice, for suffering innocently (the case of Abel); with a crown of glory, for the shame he sustained by the accusation of wicked men (the case of Naboth). Now the good man from heaven laugheth to scorn the folly of his persecutors, whose wicked malice God converteth to the eternal good of his friend. O glorious martyr, which hath washed and made white his robe in the blood of the Lamb! O holy arms, which were so often lifted up before the bar for the name of Christ! O blessed prisons, which were sanctified so many times with the presence of his body! O happy fetters, wherewith his feet were tied, and his soul loosed from the band of sin! O precious wood, which was the instrument of his glorious martyrdom! O sacred ground, which is hallowed with the martyr's blood! from whence it crieth unto heaven for vengeance, by so much more forcible than Abel's blood by how much his cause was more honourable, and his torments greater. And the soul from heaven prayeth for his benefactors and friends on earth, by so much the more effectually by how much they draw nearer his steps in life and conversation. The body was locked in prison, but the soul was made free; the dungeon was dark and loathsome, but the mind was illuminated with light from God. The members were replenished with wounds and wallowed with blood. But although the outward man was corrupted, yet the inward man was renewed from day to day; the lump of earth was betrayed to the hands of the wicked men, and they have executed their malice upon it; for what else could be expected at their hands, being his disciples who was a murderer from the beginning? But his spirit, purified with the fire of tribulation, as gold in a furnace from all earthly dross, returned to Him that made him.

Therefore, I may truly conclude of our martyr with the words of St. Cyprian: The enemy locked his feet and made fast those happy legs with infamous fetters, as though his soul might also with his body be fettered, or that gold with the rust of this iron be corrupted. These fetters and locks are no bands, but an ornament to the servant of God and confessor of His name; the feet of Christians are not tied to their rebuke, but clarified to their renown. O happy feet, born in a good hour, which are not by the smith, but by the Lord of glory, set at liberty! O happy feet, bound in a good hour, which have run so blessed a race to paradise! O happy feet, bound for a while in this world that they may be always free with God! O happy feet, made heavy and slow

with bolts and horse-locks, but light and swift in their journey unto Christ, for the expectation of our felicity promised is secure and certain (as learned Leo telleth us) where is participation of our Lord's Passion. What shall we, then, think of this constant man who hath fought a good fight, who hath consummated his course, who hath kept his faith? What else, but that our Lord hath rendered unto him his crown of justice, a just judge, and that he resteth from all his labours, for his works do follow him? Whereby the Catholic reader may understand and learn that it is not an easy matter to be made worthy of the crown of martyrdom, beholding so blessed and perfect a man to pass into the same hardly through shame and rebukes, banishment from his country, displeasure of his friends, persecution of enemies, need and poverty, imprisonment, dungeon, stocks, fetters, chains, bolts, horse-locks, manacles, false evidence of witnesses suborned, wicked verdict of false juries, cruel sentence of wicked judges, rope and gallows, the bloody axe of the butcher, the barbarous hands of the hangman;—that man must have a resolute soul who purposeth to vanquish all these afflictions; but this man hath vanquished: and how? By following the advice of his Captain, who biddeth us first sit down and reckon the charges before we lay the foundations. The want of which consideration is the true cause of the miserable return of so many cold and inconstant Catholics into their old vomits again. This is the way to heaven, this is the ladder of Jacob, these are the steps to martyrdom; we must not think that any thing chanceth to the servants of God without His consent and providence, of whom He hath said, "He that toucheth you, toucheth the apple of mine eye:" nothing can be done against them by men on earth but it is before by the premeditate council of God concluded in heaven. Pilate had no power over Christ but as it was given him from above, nor any tyrants in their days over the holy martyrs without God's permission. Whom He purposeth to crown He suffereth the enemy to rack, not accepting redemption that they might find a better resurrection. And though the simple people are borne in hand in printed books, published with privilege and authority, that no man suffereth for his conscience, yet the innocency of this man is apparent to God, before whose eyes the subtle enemy can cast no mist nor colour of treason against him; and the same one day will be apparent to the world, when this blast of heresy will be blown down to hell again from whence it had root. And neither was our glorious martyr at all discouraged with the name of traitor, for he had read that



St. Stephen was accused to have spoken words against God and Moses ; St. Paul to be a seditious fellow ; and Christ our Saviour a subverter of His own nation and an enemy to Cæsar. Yea, it was the common practice of old paynim tyrants to feign that they punished in holy men, not religion, but treason ; and this they were not ashamed to publish, envying the confessors of truth the name and honour of martyrs. And I pray you is it any marvel, for what participation hath justice with iniquity ? Or what society is there between light and darkness ? Or what agreement between Christ and Belial ? Or what part hath the faithful with the infidel ? The light of the sun, which is a friend to all the world, is yet an enemy to weak eyes ; but he that is in filth let him be filthy still. Our holy confessor is past their malice, his soul in glory, his memory in benediction, his ashes and relics in veneration. The sun when it riseth clear, pierceth not more bright from east to west than the fame of his death pierced the hearts of all Wales from north to south ; the wiser sort lamenting to see justice trodden under foot, the simple people honouring his patience and constancy for the faith of the old Britons their dear progenitors. Yea, I dare say, that among so great a multitude as were beholders of this cruel tragedy, there were not a score present but they believed him at that instant (notwithstanding all his external miseries) to be in far better case than themselves ; for that nation, although the terror of laws driveth it to dissemble with the world, yet cannot be brought generally to believe this new deceit of lying masters to be true, nor to persuade themselves the faith of their forefathers (from whom they had received so many monuments and examples of virtue and godliness) to be false. It is not the learning of ministers, neither their good life, nor their great miracles, that can persuade a whole nation from the religion which it hath kept since the Apostles' time to this unfortunate age inviolably. And lest I be thought to forge this thing of my countrymen, I refer me to those who were at this man's arraignment and execution ; they can report the demeanour of the people towards him. I refer me to the executioner, who caused himself to be shut up in a chamber close prisoner, for fear of his life, and came forth at length with a timorous heart to execute this cruel deed ; he can resolve you with what countenance his speeches were received of the multitude, when he lifted up the martyr's head, and showed it to the people, saying, "This is White's head, this is White's head ;" being either not so bold or not so shameless, as to name him traitor, according to their ac-

customed manner in such a play. I refer me to the gaoler, who can witness with what difficulty necessary things for his execution were provided. The ladder he was fain to steal at midnight, from the backside of a man's house. The coals his servants were forced to carry on their backs from the coal-pits two long miles, for want of a horse, which he could neither borrow nor hire. The axe he was glad to take from the butcher's stall, because he might not entreat any smith to defile his hands with such a work. What should I speak of the pan wherein his quarters were boiled ; of the water, fire, rope, and other implements necessary to the slaughter ? How hardly the said gaoler came by these things that day the town of Wrexham can testify. And is it any wonder ? The people knew his innocency, being well acquainted with the good man's conversation the space of twenty years together ; they knew his cause to be just and honest, being directly for religion. They knew the example to be rare, the like never heard of in Wales since the death of St. Winifred, tracing therein the happy steps of his blessed countryman St. Alban, the first martyr of the ancient Britons, and protomartyr of this island.

Albanus is  
White in  
English.

But it may be here marvelled why the gaoler showed himself more forward than his office required to spill the blood of the good man, whom a little before he greatly favoured. Forsooth, the poor wretch was enjoined in penance by the judges to play the hangman for a fault that he had committed after the prisoner's return from the council, the which was this : having conceived a good opinion of him and his fellows, he was contented to set them at liberty, upon their only promise to return against the next assize following, wherein they should be arraigned, having lately been manacled and indicted of high treason. And although the prisoners at the time appointed kept promise, nevertheless the gaoler was shent and put in fear of his life. But at this cruel murder he made the magistrates some parts of amends.

Now the execution being ended, Lewis Gronow, the good man's principal accuser, beholding such cruelty done to him, and knowing him to be innocent, repented with Judas for betraying innocent blood ; but he brought not the money back again with Judas the which he had received for his life. For he came to Denbigh, where the next assize following was kept (his conscience moving him, no doubt by the special providence of God that the innocency of the martyr and his companions might be evident to the world,



and the adversaries' malice detected) ; before the gaoler and a great multitude of people (whose eyes glared to hear the discourse), he acknowledged his fault to the prisoners, as it may appear in a letter sent from the said prisoners to their friends, of the same matter, whereof this is the copy.

*"A copy of a Letter sent from John Hughes and Robert Moris concerning Gronow his confession to them at the assize at Denbigh in May, after the execution of Mr. White.*

After our hearty commendations, these are to let you understand that in the assize week a thing chanced unto us greatly beyond our expectation ; for Lewis Gronow, our principal adversary, came into our gaol, of whom we demanded why he did so wilfully cast his soul away by slandering us so shamefully. To the which Gronow answered that he never accused any of us both, but that all his speeches and doings were against Mr. White alone. We replied that his examination was read before the bar, wherein appeared how he bare witness against us all three. Gronow answered, 'Whatsoever was read or spoken before the bar as proceeding from me, more than I tell you, they have belied me.' And therewith he began to wring his hands and to sigh and groan, making great lamentation, and exclaiming against himself ; further telling us that he was tormented in conscience for the offence he had committed against Mr. White, more than for any offence that ever he had done in his life. Here he told us that he was enticed to this wicked deed by the fair promises of Sir Hugh Soullely, vicar of Wrexham, and David Edwards, mercer, to see him enlarged out of prison and his debts discharged, the which was afterwards by them performed accordingly. Then he was sent to the Holt to bear witness against us, where we were indicted ; and for his good service there, the vicar and mercer aforesaid wrote a letter in his behalf to Sir George Bromley to procure him by his friendship a placard. The man went to the council with his letter, caused his bill to be drawn, and tendered it to Sir George to be signed as he walked in the garden at Ludlow ; the which Mr. Justice perusing, and finding therein no special matter specified why he should have a placard, refused to sign it ; whereupon Gronow delivered him the letter from the vicar and mercer, wherein they signified that the bearer was the man which followed against the papists ; the which when Sir George Bromley perceived, taking Gronow by the hand, demanded whether he was the man that followed against the papists. Gronow answered that he was the man that followed against Richard White, and no man else. Mr. Justice replied that he could not have his bill signed unless he would follow against all three. And so turning from him, A most corrupt judge. he sent two of his gentlemen which attended on him in the garden, Thomas Puleston and Moris Jones, one after another, to persuade him to follow against us three, if he would have his bill signed, the which (as he said) he utterly refused to grant. This

course failing, Mr. Justice was in hand with him to swear that he would at the least bear witness against Richard White, but he denied to swear; then he required him to put in sureties, and that also he denied to do. In the end Gronow yielded to deliver his promise, and gave Sir George his hand thereupon, that he would meet him at the next assize following; and so his bill was signed and a placard procured from the council for him; by virtue whereof and by friendship of the vicar and mercer before named, there was gathered for him at Wrexham thirty shillings; and afterwards, returning home to his own country among his friends and kinsfolk, twenty marks. All this he protested to be true before Coytmor, our gaoler, and a great number of people then present at his speeches. This is all we can certify you at this time. From Denbigh, the 15th of May, anno Domini 1585.

Your daily beadsmen,

JOHN HUGHES and ROBERT MORIS."

Thus you may see the man's innocency confirmed every way, in his lifetime, at his death, and after his death, by the deposition of a gentleman at his arraignment, by his own protestation at his last breath, by the adversaries' confession here, and by God's miraculous operation for him even in his lifetime (as it may appear by what hath been said already); but much more after his martyrdom, through the just punishment which fell to both judges at once.

For the one lost his credit, returned home from the bar, and left his wits behind him, who yet liveth an idiot. The other judge lost his credit with all his friends, and within a while after his life also, that he neither enjoyed office after this day's work nor good hour. The greatest part of the jury dropped away miserably, and never lived to see the next assize following. The crier be-

came a fool and a momme, and so lived a long time, and in the end died wretchedly. But the plague which chanced to David Edwards the mercer was notable, who, as his malice towards this servant of God exceeded, so his punishment was dreadful, God recompensing the wretch according to his works in weight and measure. For as he walked abroad with one of his neighbours, about the beginning of Lent, in the same year wherein the holy man died, being now come to the place where he had taken him, suddenly was catched; for there he received his just hire, and thence returned home sick, was laid in a bed; finally, he ended his life in great repentance without fruit (not unlike to the death of Antiochus the tyrant), often naming the martyr and cursing the hour he took him. Of whom it is reported that no man,

John Wil-  
liams Ma-  
dock Goch.

Sir George  
Bromley.

Simon  
Thelwall.

Christo-  
pherson.

David Ed-  
wards'  
plaguy end.



from the beginning of his sickness, might well approach near him, alive nor dead, for the horrible stink of his body. So his own foot was caught in the snare he had laid for his neighbour. By the which terrible examples the persecutors may learn to take heed how they anger the servants of God, lest withal He be also moved who dwelleth in them; for the apostle saith that holy men are the temple of God. And although the martyr hideth from their eyes the invisible sword wherewith He striketh, nevertheless it is manifest that he hath it always ready to draw out when God appointeth. Therefore St. Gregory exhorteth to exhibit due fear and reverence to holy men, who when they are moved unto anger, who else is provoked but their Lord who possesseth them? Therefore by so much the more careful we ought to be in avoiding the displeasure of God's saints by how much the more we are persuaded that our Lord doth inhabit in them, who is able to revenge their cause when He listeth. The which good counsel of the holy father a gentleman of the country may do well to remember and follow, who for me shall be nameless, because I seek not his discredit, but the glory of God and conversion of his soul, whereof I pray our Lord Jesus Christ that he may have grace to consider.

A fearful death.

Marry, by this token you shall understand whom I mean, that it was his hap to ride on an ambling mare from his parish church upon a Sunday morning, and in the way the said mare received a great blow on her side, the sound whereof was heard by himself and all his people which then attended on him, but nothing seen. Forthwith the gentleman was forced to light, and a sledge sent for to carry the mare into the stable; and there she died shortly after; and being flayed, the place on her side where the blow had been given appeared blue. The which accident I suppose to be a warning unto the gentleman that he should not imbrue his hands in the blood of this martyr. For the same chance fell out in an. Dom. 1578, a little before the apprehension of the man against whom he hath been a principal doer. The which miracle, and the rest that are here in this writing declared, were not showed to make our martyr of a more blessed life before God, but to signify unto us that he was a blessed man and his soul in high favour with God, and to stir in our souls that due reverence towards him which his virtues deserved; for God hath promised to honour them who will glorify Him. The like may be said by the manifold great and strange wonders that his blood, bones, ashes, and other holy monuments of his, have done; the which in particular the incredulity of this time will not suffer to be published;

but they shall be one day (God willing) made manifest to the glory of God, honour of His saint, confirmation of the Catholic faith, and confutation of heresy.

And here I will end, beseeching the blessed soul of this glorious martyr to bear with me where I have not expressed his heroical endeavours at large agreeable to the worthiness thereof; for he knoweth well that there was not in me want of good will, but of knowledge and cunning sufficient to set forth such a matter. Protesting that I have spoken but few things of much which might be said in the commendation of so holy a man, for I do not mean to add any thing to his praise and honour,—he needeth not our praise, neither desireth the same,—it is enough for him that he hath eternal praise and honour with God and His angels in heaven. But I have bestowed my travail herein to signify the good will I bare him on earth, to procure his mediation for me in heaven, to give the Catholic reader an example of constancy, to bring the adversary into remembrance of his own madness and wickedness, and to let the world understand what open injustice and violence the poor afflicted Catholics sustain for their conscience and religion, under the visor of treason, at the hands of malicious heretics.

---

### Correspondence.\*

#### THE RUSSIAN CHURCH.

SIR,—The question of the reunion of the Eastern and Latin Churches is now emerging after a century's oblivion. The Bishops of western Germany have established the *Petrus-Verein*, an association of prayers, to which the Pope has given indulgences. In the parish-churches prayers for the renewal of the union are recited after the offices. The association is also established in some dioceses of France, and in one, I believe, there are 30,000 members. The most influential of the French laity are turning their attention this way.

\* It has become necessary to remind the readers of the *Rambler* that when the present division of the matter published into Editorial Articles, Communicated Articles, and Correspondence was adopted, only such general responsibility was undertaken by its Conductors for the opinions and representations advanced under the second and third heads as is involved in their being parties to the publication. Hence admission under the second head was promised, and has been granted, to articles which by no means represent the opinions of the Conductors; while the Correspondence was intended for the discussion and explanation of various matters—historical, ecclesiastical, political, and the like—about which individuals might feel an interest, whether their views agreed with or differed from those generally put forth in the body of the Review.



Besides praying, something is done, or at least written. F. Gagarin's pamphlet, *La Russie sera-t-elle catholique ?* has made most stir. His name, his former diplomatic position, the relations which he has maintained or renewed with several of his countrymen and old coreligionists were enough to prevent his pamphlet lying unheeded. Though it was rather a programme than a treatise, it stirred up much opposition. I have seen replies of all kinds, in French, German, and Greek. They are all of Russian origin, except that in Greek (since translated and published with improvements at Paris), which was written by Kara-Theodori, the Sultan's physician. Only one of them is worth notice, that of M. Wassilieff, the chaplain of the Russian embassy at Paris, which appeared in the *Union Chrétienne*, a Paris Sunday paper. M. Wassilieff speaks like a gentleman, and says things that may lead to unity. But he says, that in case of reunion, the Eastern Church ought to stipulate that the Western Church should no longer use a dead language. In Germany, several writings on this subject have been published, especially some articles in the theological quarterly of Tübingen. Two years ago there was some Russian correspondence in the *Journal de Bruxelles* to the same effect. The *Civiltà Cattolica* has devoted several pages to this matter. But this is not the tenth part of all that has been written during the last six years. I cannot mention every thing in a letter ; but I must not omit the *Memoirs of Count Schouvaloff*,\* first a schismatic, then an infidel, then a Catholic, and finally a Barnabite, in which order he died at Paris, with the reputation of a saint, shortly after the publication of his work. The Russians have read him with as much avidity as they read De Maistre's *Soirées de Saint Pétersbourg*, and have learned from him what true conversion means, and what is the Catholic idea of sanctity. You English, Catholic or Protestant, might read with equal advantage these new confessions of a new Augustine.

These Catholic appeals to unity are far from provoking a merely hostile demonstration from the Orientals. The above-named *Union Chrétienne* was founded to smooth the way to the union of all denominations of Christians. The misfortune is, that the usual writers in this *Union* are not men of irreproachable antecedents, always excepting M. Wassilieff, who writes under the signature of Abou-Joussouf. The Abbé Guettée, for instance, author of a history of the French Church and of a history of the Jesuits, though he has talents, a good style, and extensive knowledge, is always called a Jansenist, though he denies it ; and he does not hesitate to attack the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. These gentlemen are making a union to prevent the union. Still, their paper is far from useless : it ventilates the question ; it discredits the idea of independent national churches, which the Orientals dream is the normal state of the institution of Christ ; it dissipates some doctrinal prejudices, and establishes some sort of communication between East and West. This is not to be despised ; and we must own that this

\* *Ma Conversion et ma Vocation*, par le R. P. Schouvaloff.

publication, and others of no greater intrinsic value, are gradually leading the Orientals to say that the two Churches agree in doctrine, and are only separated by differences of discipline. The *Nord* has just declared this in so many words ; and F. Martinoff, formerly, like F. Gagarin, a schismatic, now a Jesuit, lately said the same. If your readers were to consult the works of private theologians, they might be unable to come to this conclusion ; but if they only read the authoritative symbolic books of the Russians, they would see that the identity of doctrine is incontestable, while the differences of expression are easily explicable by the differences of the points of view and of terminology. We need not, then, be surprised that the Holy Synod has acknowledged this identity in a solemn act. In 1839, when the Uniate Bishops of Russia left the Catholic Church for the orthodox communion, the Holy Synod declared that their doctrine, in spite of their adhesion to the Council of Florence, had remained orthodox, and that their only fault had been the schism which they had made in the Oriental hierarchy.

These facts are very significant. Take up any old Russian book of controversy, you will find there long lists of errors of the Latins, from shaving the beard to leaving out the Alleluia in Lent, all equally damnable and each a sufficient cause for rending the robe of Christ. The Latin theologians were of two kinds. The first, men of intelligence, who had deeply studied the Eastern dogmas ; the second, men who wrote on the faith of superficial reports, and were inclined to erect the opinions of their school into doctrines of faith. These repaid the Orientals in their own coin, and with interest. They collected every foolery uttered or published by an Eastern, attributed it to the whole Eastern Church, and often added to it what was only due to their own ignorance and misunderstanding. But the first carefully distinguished private speculations from ecclesiastical teaching, illustrated what was obscure, and so found that the foundation of the division was not the diversity of doctrines, but aversion of heart, heated by mutual reproaches and national antagonism. Thus, while the second demanded solemn retractations, public disavowals of heresies that had never been entertained, and absolution given with solemn function, the first thought that, after a few brotherly explanations, each might give the other the kiss of peace. Clearly these would appear to the others as men without zeal, under misprision of treason to the Church, willing to sacrifice their eternal interests to a sham union. The zealots have not yet become extinct ; they have made themselves heard in a Paris paper and a Polish review. So among the Russians, many still swear by the list of Latin errors, though it is becoming fine by degrees and beautifully less. The fiercest partisans now only talk of the procession of the Holy Ghost and the authority of the Pope. They have lately added the Immaculate Conception, in consequence of the ludicrous mistake of supposing that we consider the Blessed Virgin to have had no father, but to have been conceived by the Holy Ghost, like her Divine Son. But they explicitly admit the



doctrine which we really believe, even while they combat the phantom they suppose us to hold: they tell us that *Mary was preserved by the grace of God from the effects of the sin of our first parents*. This goes even farther than the Catholic dogma, which teaches that Adam forfeited for Mary, and all his descendants in the ordinary way of generation, the gift of sanctifying grace; but that this grace, which is restored to us in baptism, was given to Mary from the first instant of her existence, so that the *macula peccati*, the first effect of sin, never sullied her soul. The discussions on the procession of the Holy Ghost need not be very long, seeing that the new Russian *Catéchisme détaillé* declares that the doctrine of St. J. Damascene on this point is to be followed. Now this Greek only differs from the Latins in his terminology, and we have always considered him perfectly orthodox. The primacy of the Pope does not offer any greater difficulties. It would be enough for the Russians to acknowledge Pius IX. as the legitimate successor of the Popes whom they celebrate in their offices, and as inheriting the titles and prerogatives attributed in the offices to those Popes, by virtue of our Lord's words. Some Russians, who perceive and know that these points present no real difficulties, lay hold on certain articles of discipline; but these reservations are rather diplomatic pretexts than positions which they mean to defend.

We may, then, take it as a fact that, not the doctrinal divergence which is more apparent than real, but rather a moral indisposition is the great obstacle to the reunion. No doubt the chief indisposition arises from the historical national spirit of Russia, which is essentially anti-Polish, and therefore anti-Latin,—for religion is three parts of popular feeling. This national spirit is the result of the long antagonism between Russia and Poland, each of which sought to render itself mistress of the other. But as the Russians have, or think they have, gained the day for good, the antagonism tends to diminish on their side. A similar national spirit animates all the Oriental peoples, especially those who are under the Turkish yoke; and, as the same territory often contains a contemporary series of four or five nationalities, each of which, at its first entrance, reduced its predecessors to a state resembling slavery, these nationalities detest each other as I suppose Celts and Saxons do in Ireland, a due increase being allowed for the barbarous ferocity and obstinacy of the half-civilised Orientals. The effect of this national spirit is to make the different peoples tend to free themselves from all foreign ecclesiastical influence. Thus in 1848 the Slaves and Roumans of Transylvania took the opportunity to rid themselves of the authority of the Patriarch of Constantinople. For several years the Bulgarians have been at open war with the Phanariot clergy. They want Bishops and priests of their own race, and finally to erect themselves into a distinct patriarchate. Their object is well known to the Patriarch and Synod of Constantinople, who therefore refuse to allow them priests, much less Bishops, of any but Greek origin. In the same way, the Churches of Bosnia, Moldavia, Wallachia, and Servia

are tending towards separation. Division from Byzantium is the order of the day ; and the gravity of these schismatic tendencies is increased by the fact that the Greek schism itself is chiefly due to the political antagonism between the East and West, and that the idea of the necessity of ecclesiastical unity has been designedly undermined among the people to justify this schism. The whole patriarchate of Constantinople is in process of disintegration, and ecclesiastical communion will be reduced to a simple commemoration of the Patriarch of new Rome, and of the other Oriental Patriarchs, in the offices of the Church.

Whilst the spirit of nationality was thus arousing itself to break the old ecclesiastical connections, a new spirit was rising, and has now made an alliance with the national spirit—I mean, sympathy with the West, or rather with France. During the Crimean war, the Russians and French were so inclined to interchange tokens of friendship, that the generals on both sides found it necessary to limit it by orders of the day. Since the peace, the Russians flock to France more numerous than ever ; and when the two governments concluded an alliance, it was so much to the taste of both people that no one thought it even strange. The same tendencies are apparent in the Slavie, Roumanie, and Bulgarian provinces of the Turkish empire. They wish to preserve their nationality, but also to inoculate it with the French spirit. The feeling of friendship for France knocks down many a bar. People get to look favourably on all that constitutes French life, and thus gradually lose their contempt for the Latin religion and its professors. I am safe in saying that within the memory of man the disposition to reunite with the Catholic Church has never been less unfavourable than now.

But I must come to something more particular ; and first, with regard to the Russian clergy. In the 18th and in the beginning of the 19th century, the tendency of their learned ecclesiastics was towards Protestantism ; many were real Protestants. Gradually things have grown better, and those who dare to exhibit any heterodox views are rare enough now. The Emperor Nicholas, or rather God's providence through him, has uprooted Protestantism from Russia. The following anecdote will illustrate the manner how it was done. A member of the Holy Synod had composed a new catechism, which had to be approved by the Synod before it could be printed. Now the Synod, like the Roman Congregations, employs a certain number of priests to make provisional reports on each affair brought before it. The catechism in question was by chance submitted to a young priest of good talents and intentions,—M. Wassilieff, I believe,—who in reading over the catechism discovered sundry propositions which reproduced the errors of Luther on merits and good works. These he mentioned in his report, which occasioned an ardent controversy in the Synod. Half the Bishops declared for the catechism, half against it. Protasoff, the Procurator, endeavoured to arrange matters, but was forced by his failure to report the case to the



emperor. Nicholas refused to enter into the merits of the question, but asked which side the Metropolitan of St. Petersburg espoused. "Sire, against the catechism." "I cannot send him away from the city, so send all the Bishops who are in favour of the catechism back to their dioceses." Thus was the Protestant party in the Holy Synod brought to naught. A catechism in conformity with the ancient teaching was afterwards compiled; and the orthodox Bishops, the dominant party, took care to banish from the ecclesiastical schools every thing that savoured of Protestantism. This anecdote I have heard from persons said to be well informed. One thing is certain, that Protestant opinions no longer dare to lift up their heads among the Russian clergy. There is one point, however, in which the influence of the old Bible Societies has had a permanent effect. The Russians are uncertain about the canon of Scripture, and do not scruple to detach therefrom certain books cited as Scripture in the catechism of Peter Mogila, the principal dogmatic monument of the Eastern Church. Now, to conclude, all those who adhere most closely to the ancient doctrine, and have been or are most opposed to the introduction of the Protestant leaven, exhibit the least aversion for the union; certainly, if it ever takes place, it will be by means of this party.

The educated laity may be divided into four classes—the free-thinkers, the revolutionists, the orthodox adversaries of the union, and the orthodox with decidedly Catholic tendencies. For the free-thinkers in Russia, as elsewhere, the Church is a great bugbear; and since the union would be an element of liberty to her, they are by no means favourably disposed to it. The revolutionists are not very different; their politico-religious education is derived from the revolutionary and anti-Catholic journals of France; but among them, those who wish to see the revolution afterwards consolidated by order have more equitable opinions. The orthodox adversaries of the union are actuated, some by inveterate prejudice against the doctrine and discipline of the Western Church, others by fear of the tyranny which the Roman court would practise in Russia, others by the spirit of conservatism, or the fear lest the union would be the occasion of political troubles, and by other considerations of this kind. I have no remarks to make upon those members of the orthodox communion whose sentiments are Catholic, except that their number is infinitely greater than one could at first imagine. The conversions which are continually going on in the upper classes, in spite of the false position which the converts make for themselves and their descendants, form one of the signs of a disposition widely spread. It seems scarcely credible, but it is true, that the Russians who accompanied the Empress-mother in her first journey to Italy after the Crimean war were mostly converts. This was no secret to the court of St. Petersburg; but it was thought advisable to wink at what the law calls apostasies, seeing that the apostates were the men of the highest character in the empire. I may remark, by the way, that the Russian converts, men and women, are in general an honour

both to the Catholic religion and to their country. I do not like parading names in public ; but there can be no harm in my mentioning here the Princes Galitzin, Schouvaloff (a Barnabite, now dead), and Gagarin (a Jesuit), Madame Swetchine and Madame de la Ferronnays. In most of the great Russian families there are now some converts ; and the door once opened, the procession winds through surely if slowly. It is certain that in most of these families a fulcrum might be found for the support of the movement of reconciliation.

The middle classes are not numerous in Russia, if we compare it with other European countries. At Moscow and in the provinces, many persons of this class belong to the sect of Starovères, or partisans of the ancient liturgical books. Among the rest, Western sympathies are very common.

The serfs in general know little either of East or West ; for them, the difference between the Latin and Greek Church, is only one of rites, mingled with a few traditions of respect for the Patriarch of Constantinople. Still it would be a mistake to leave them out of our reckoning ; for the greatest dangers might arise from their opposition. We must not suppose that they could be united by a mere feat of sleight of hand. It would be necessary to explain to them with equal simplicity and sincerity how this great work is the will of Jesus Christ, and in conformity with the Slavonic liturgies. All this would require consummate prudence and tact.

The Slaves and Roumans of the Austrian empire are in an infinitely more favourable disposition, as might have been seen when, a few years ago, Monsignore de Lucca, the nuncio at Vienna, carried to the Slaves and Roumans of Transylvania some sacred vessels and other presents from the Pope. The schismatics received him with as much good-will, respect, and honour as their uniate compatriots. In these countries Bishops and priests may be found who make no secret of their desire for union. The people incline the same way. A foreign nobleman, who lately held a military command in those districts, lately told me, "It would be unwise to attempt to bring about the union by means of priests ; the chances would be, that at first the schismatics would not listen to them ; and if the first beginning is a failure, the end will be a failure too. But if the Government were to order some officers who have been stationed for some time in the country to make the people understand the necessity of being reconciled with the Pope, there would very probably be no resistance. They would be delighted to see the Emperor able to hear Mass with them. There would be no need of threats, far less of persecution. The people only remain in schism because there is no one to draw them out of it." It will be asked why the Austrian Government does not take these steps. There are many things to be said in answer ; one excuse—a very weak one, I think—is, that if the schismatic parishes become Catholic, some Catholic abbeys and chapters would be ruined. To explain this, I should have to enter into longer details than I have room for.



Ever since Moldavia and Wallachia were emancipated, or rather placed in a permanent state of revolution, the obstacles to the union have rather increased than diminished, because the revolutionary spirit is every where essentially anti-Catholic. In Bulgaria and Servia the difficulties would be much less ; but all these populations have their eyes fixed upon St. Petersburg.

In the other provinces of the East, the symptoms have been lately very favourable. A fact of great importance, which passed almost without notice, happened at Constantinople, when Monsignore Ferrieri was sent to the Sultan to announce the accession of Pius IX. A deputation of the Armenian consistory, composed of the most considerable men of the nation, presented to the nuncio a profession of faith extracted from the writings of the ancient Armenian doctors, and containing statements upon the production of the Holy Ghost from Father and Son, upon the Incarnation, and the universal authority of the Pope, that were entirely Catholic. The deputation asked, in the name of the whole Armenian nation, to be admitted to Catholic communion upon the basis of this profession of faith. What were the instructions of Monsignore Ferrieri I know not ; I only know that the Prelate demanded of the Armenians that the nomination of their Patriarch and Bishops should be in the hands of the Congregation of Propaganda. The Armenians rejected this condition as contrary to all the ancient canons, but notwithstanding this failure, they addressed themselves, some years later, to Monseigneur Sibour, Archbishop of Paris. However good a Bishop, he certainly was not a good diplomatist ; the body of French Cardinals, more important by their talents and prudence than by their position, would have been a far better intermediary. For some reason, the application of the Armenians to the Archbishop of Paris had no results. But in order that some memorial might remain of their disposition to reunite themselves with the Roman Church, the Armenians caused an account of the whole affair to be printed in the *Revue d'Orient*, a journal which was in those days published at Paris.

About the same time another fact no less characteristic took place in Egypt. It happened that a Patriarch of Alexandria was to be elected ; there were two parties, each supporting its own candidate, and they were unable to come to any understanding. To have done with it, they resolved to refer the election to the Catholic Vicar-Apostolic who resided at Cairo. He was ready to accede to their request, provided they would be reconciled to the Roman Church. A negotiation was entered into for this object, and promised at one time to succeed ; but when the English consul smelt it out, he found means to upset every thing. I do not know whether the good disposition of the Copts found favour in the eyes of the French consul ; yet it is notorious that France has the greatest political interest in the return of the Copts to Catholic communion. There are numbers of them in the Phaïoum, a military position of immense strength. The services which these people rendered to Napoleon I. in his Egyptian

expedition, and his Coptic regiments, the remains of which lasted till the end of the first Empire, ought not to have been forgotten, especially as every one sees that either the whole North of Africa is destined one day to become French territory, or else that Algeria will never be held quietly and peaceably. It is strange, then, that so little was made of an opportunity of gaining over and uniting by means of religion several hundred thousands of inhabitants in the heart of a Mussulman country. But God has His own designs, and it is to be hoped that He will not suffer the good dispositions which He inspires to be for ever crossed and rendered nugatory.

It would take too much time to pass in review the other Christian nations of the East, and to enumerate the conversions that have already taken place ; what I have already said is enough to show that the hopes which I entertain are not altogether visionary.

But I have not yet exposed the principal foundation of my expectations. After God's help, without which all labour is vain, my hope lies chiefly in the vague suspicion which may be found in all the Churches of the East, that their position is not altogether regular. This sentiment shows itself in all the books published by members of those Churches. Without being attacked or provoked, their writings are all apologies, miserable enough no doubt, because they come to nothing more than a defence of their separation on the ground of the tyrannous spirit of the Roman Church ; as though the words of St. Dionysius of Alexandria could ever cease to be the expression of evangelical truth : " We ought rather to suffer all things than to consent to the division of the Church of God ; for the martyrs who suffered for the unity of the Church are no less glorious than those who suffered rather than sacrifice to idols." The feeling of this truth is doubtless much weakened in the Eastern Churches, but it is far from being completely destroyed ; and the separatist tendencies of which I spoke above are giving way to those which would again bring this feeling into play. The starovism which is spreading in Russia, and which is opposed by the Russian Bishops in writings that are really remarkable, has had a favourable effect in proving the necessity of ecclesiastical unity, and the guilt and misery of schism. Now we can easily see that when once people are persuaded that separation is not a normal state, they will not be far from making some effort to put an end to this state of things.

Some efforts have already been made ; the great desideratum is to discover the terms of an accommodation. I have had several conversations on this subject with Latins and with Russians who have studied the question, and I have read a good number of pamphlets on both sides. Many of the Latins say, " We have come to a union so many times ; so many Bishops and Patriarchs have at different times been united to the Church ; but the schism was always quickly reëstablished. If, then, we again unite, we must first strengthen the links, and especially we must reserve to the Pope or Propaganda the nomination of all Patriarchs, Metropolitans, Archbishops, and Bishops." Others, on the contrary, remark



that such pretensions put an obstacle in the way even of the commencement of a negotiation ; that other means might be found to maintain an intimate union between Churches of different rites ; that we must be practical, and consequently that we must be contented with that which is essential and possible ; and, that no mistake may be made, we must study the ideas which are current among the Orientals, especially amongst the Russians who are labouring to reconcile the Churches. They concede that formerly the Pope was the first Patriarch, and that in this quality he exercised a certain power throughout the whole Church. They do not discuss the question whether our Lord established a universal pastor over His Church, though this truth is expressed with far greater clearness in their liturgical books than in ours ; they choose rather to base their opinions about the authority of the Popes upon the canons of the old œcumenical councils. They all have a great horror of arbitrary power ; and without entering into the question whether the Pope ought to be over or under the council, they say that the Pope ought to govern by the canons of the councils. They have small love for the Roman congregations, especially for the Propaganda, though they approve of the idea which actuated its founder. They will never submit to this congregation ; for this determination they bring forward many motives, but their grand reason is, that they are not infidels. They dislike also the congregation for the revision of oriental liturgies ; they ask whether any of the members of this congregation understand any of the oriental languages. They have similar objections against almost all the Roman congregations. Innocent III., they say, decided matters in consistory ; and so his decisions have become *decretals*, that is, parts of the body of ecclesiastical law. In these consistories we may expect, they say, something of the holiness and wisdom of the Apostles ; elsewhere it is to be feared our account may be with the finesse and corruption of the lower Empire. In all this there may be much prejudice ; but every practical man knows that it is as necessary to take account of prejudices as of the best-established truths. But since questions must be put into form before they can be submitted to the consistory, they propose a committee of Slavonic Cardinals and ecclesiastics that shall sit at Rome for this purpose. They say that this demand does not nearly equal that of the kings of Spain, who did all in their power to hinder any question relating to their subjects being referred to Rome, and who obtained the establishment of a tribunal of the rota at Madrid, consisting of the generals of the religious orders who were fixed in Spain, and were independent of the Roman generals. They say also, that as the ancient Roman maxim still holds good in the East, that an emperor is supposed to embody all the rights and all the will of his subjects, and as in primitive times the people had a great influence in ecclesiastical affairs, it would be proper to recognise the right of the Emperor of Russia to this influence, at least within his own states ; and they think, therefore, that he might be invested with a kind of legatine power like that which the King of

Naples enjoyed under the name of *Monarchia*. You quite understand that I do not come forward as the advocate of these dangerous pretensions ; I merely make them known. But I am altogether of the opinion of Gerson, who, in a French sermon upon the reunion of the Greeks, recently published by Prince Augustin Galitzin, says : "Men of good will for peace in holy Church, whether in general between Greeks and Latins, or in particular reformatations, ought to be informed and indoctrinated principally by Holy Scripture, wherein the divine law is delivered, and next by moral philosophy, and afterwards by the holy decrees and decretals, and then by civil law. This consideration is clear ; for he who cannot discern and distinguish that which is of Divine right from that which is only of positive law, erreth easily in judging either of the one or of the other. . . . For there is nothing which so much troubleth the government of Christendom as the wish to rule the spirituality and the temporality in the same manner."

I have put down some general observations on the reunion of the East and West ; one day, please God, I will try to say something on each of the rites of the East.

Y. Z.

#### SEMINARIES OF THE CHURCH.

SIR,—No one desires more earnestly than the writer of these lines, that free discussion should be allowed us on all matters which the Church has not ruled. No one laments more than I do that bigotry and jealousy which would enthrone the decisions of individuals, or of parties, or of schools, as if divine truths, unassailable and irreversible. Nor will I yield to any one in my desire, that the secular education of Catholics in the middle and upper classes should be the best of its kind, and such as to enable them to take their place in society by the side of Protestants of their own rank. It is not inconsistent with such avowals for me to express my sorrow at a portion of the letter signed "X.Y.Z.," which appeared in your Number for July. I believe that letter has incurred the animadversion of one of our newspapers ; but I have not read it, and, even though I chance to repeat it in substance in what I am going to say, that will not be a reason for my not saying it. For your correspondents should be answered, if they need it, in your Magazine, not out of it, that those who read the one side may read the other.

My own complaint with "X.Y.Z." is this, that in a lay magazine he has discussed a purely clerical subject. If it is a mistake in ecclesiastics to go beyond their calling and their knowledge, and to lecture laymen on secular subjects, I consider it a greater in a lay "X.Y.Z." to discuss the education of the clergy, and to find fault with the existing system, which is founded on the decree of an Œcumenical Council. I certainly think that a writer should be taken



to task who finds fault with provisions sacred both from the persons whom they concern, and from the authority by which they are enforced.

The Council of Trent decrees that a seminary for the clergy shall be established in every diocese, and that it shall consist exclusively of ecclesiastics. "Hoc collegium," it says, "Dei ministrorum perpetuum seminarium sit." These seminaries, if possible, are to be erected "prope ipsas ecclesias;" the youths, there educated, "tonsurâ statim atque habitu clericali semper utentur;" they shall be "pauperum filii præcipuè;" they are admissible at twelve years of age, and they are to learn "grammatices, cantûs, computi ecclesiastici, aliarumque bonarum artium disciplinam, sacram Scripturam, libros ecclesiasticos, homilias sanctorum, et sacramentorum tradendorum, et rituum et cæremoniarum formas." Thus their education is distinctly and professedly narrow (I am not using the word in an unfavourable sense, but to express the fact), as the education of a farmer is narrow, or of an artillery officer, or of a medical man.

If any one thinks me paradoxical in thus speaking, I shelter myself behind the words of an author to which "X.Y.Z." refers. Dr. Newman, in his Dublin Lectures of 1852, speaking of liberal education, says: "If theology, instead of being cultivated as a contemplation, be limited to the purposes of the pulpit, or be represented by the catechism, it loses, not its usefulness, not its divine character, not its meritoriousness, but the particular attribute which I am illustrating; just as a face worn by tears and fasting loses its beauty, or a labourer's hand loses its delicateness; for theology, thus exercised, is not simple knowledge, but rather is an art or a business making use of theology. And thus it appears that even what is supernatural need not be liberal, nor need a hero be a gentleman, for the plain reason that one idea is not another idea."

To return:—by the side of the grave provisions of the Council which I have quoted, let us see what are the views of "X.Y.Z." I have taken the liberty to expand his sentiments into their full meaning by additions within brackets, in order to bring out what I conceive to be their inconsistency in the mouth of a Catholic.

"There are many reasons," he says, "why the question of Catholic ecclesiastical education should be assuming special importance at the present day." After mentioning some of them, he proceeds thus:

"These and other reasons make it important [not for our ecclesiastical rulers, but for your readers] to *consider, whether* any *modifications*, and of what nature, are desirable in the system of our schools and colleges, [which system was determined by the Œcumenical Council of Trent].

"As I am . . . . *simply suggesting* points for the consideration of those [of the reading public who are] better qualified [than myself] to judge, I shall make no apology for *briefly jotting down* a few questions, that have *occurred* to my mind [on a subject which, after fasting and prayer, engaged the anxious attention, and elicited

the definitive decision, of the Fathers of an Assembly 'in Spiritu Sancto congregata'].

"As regards the question of *separate* training for the clergy from boyhood, it seems to *me* [an anonymous "X.Y.Z."] that two questions may be raised, [though the Council of Trent put them to rest three centuries ago], viz. :

1. "How far it is, *per se*, *desirable*, [though the Council desires it so much as to direct the Bishops, every where and individually, to carry out '*tam pium et sanctum institutum*, prout *Spiritus Sanctus suggesserit*,'—another sort of 'suggestion'].

2. "And further, how far," with our present objects and needs, "such a system would be *even possible*, [though the Sancta Synodus thinks it so possible, as to decree that, if there be negligence in any persons 'in hoc seminarii erectione et conservatione,' the competent authority '*acriter corripere, eosque ad omnia supra dicta cogere debeat*'].

"I am far from saying that there would not be *room* for a St. Sulpice in England : [so far I concede to the sacro-sancta Œcumenica Synodus, though I must still maintain, pace Patrum Reverendissimorum, that what they call '*sanctum et pium opus*' is the exception, not the rule].

"But [I repeat, in spite of the Council] I *cannot help thinking*, that if the class of men who are trained for the Protestant ministry at our public schools and universities are to be enlisted for the service of the altar, a *very different system* from that of St. Sulpice [which is behind the day as following the directions of the Church] would be found necessary, at least for many of them."

I need not pursue my comment further ; before concluding, however, I am reminded by the last sentence in the foregoing paragraph, that I ought to contrast another passage from "X.Y.Z.," not with the Tridentine Decrees, but with a sentence in the correspondence of the *Guardian* newspaper of last Wednesday.

"X.Y.Z." says :

"Why is it that, while the Protestant minister, ignorant for the most part of theology, fluctuating and uncertain in his views, &c. . . can usually secure at least the *respectful attention* of an ordinary congregation to his stammering exposition of a mutilated creed, the Catholic priest, &c. . . . Does that intellectual refinement, that power of varied illustration, that mastery of language and thought, which are the results of an *educated* taste, and fair acquaintance with the standard literatures, both prose and poetry, of our own and other countries, *avail* in the one case to *light up* the broken shadows of an unsatisfying religion with a *glory* not their own, while in the other," &c. &c.

On the other hand, "Medicus Mayfairensis," writing in the *Guardian* of August 8, with what seems like a feeling experience of the matter he is treating of, says :

"It strikes me, that if from time to time some *educated* men *who can speak English in their own tongue*, and *not in the dreary*,



roundabout, latinised, *somniferous* dialect which is *consecrated to the use of the pulpits in the Establishment*, would take the trouble to get on a tub on a Sunday afternoon in the Park, . . . it would absolutely neutralise the spirit of those trading agitators," &c.

Had I leisure to search the columns of the *Times*, I should find passages in still more vehement antagonism with "X.Y.Z." on the subject of Anglican University preaching.

Thus he is as little countenanced by Protestants in his facts as by the Tridentine Fathers in his opinions.

H. O.

August 14.

### COLLEGIATE EDUCATION.

SIR,—Your correspondent "X.Y.Z." has opened several questions bearing on education in our schools and colleges, the importance of which can hardly be overrated; and the object of keeping these and similar questions before the public eye, provided it be done with moderation, and in the spirit of deference to ecclesiastical superiors, would seem of sufficient magnitude to counterbalance the possibility of occasional mistakes in the mode of treating them. We are no doubt in some danger of presuming that existing methods of education, extensively adopted, and supported by the sanction of venerable names, are right simply because they are established. It is my own conviction, founded on much thought and considerable præ-Catholic as well as actually Catholic experience, that more than one of the characteristics of the present system to which "X.Y.Z." objects, or at least demurs, is founded on a better basis than that of mere prescription; and the very hearty agreement with him which I recognise, and shall express, on some matters of principle which he has touched in his letter, induces me to hope that, although I may not succeed in convincing him, he will be able to feel that my differences with him are not the result of any blind, or merely "conservative" adherence to things as they are.

Your correspondent thinks the practice which prevails in some of our colleges (as, for instance, at St. Edmund's, Old-Hall Green), of keeping up a distinction throughout all the successive stages, and in all the various departments of the collegiate course, between students preparing for the Church and those destined for secular professions, has a tendency to isolate the clergy from the laity, by giving them too simply professional a character, narrowing their studies and tastes, lowering their social position, and proportionately weakening their future influence. As a necessary consequence of this opinion, he would enlarge the cleric's sphere of reading at college, drawing the line of exclusion at the point only where useful or recreative literature becomes immoral. Such, I think, is the substance of his view on this whole subject. He illustrates it, however, by reference to what he considers the "great moral and

social influence of the Anglican clergy," as derived from their association at school and college with those from whose ranks the various secular callings are replenished.

Your correspondent is no doubt aware that the separate system adopted at Old Hall is an exception to the rule of the English Catholic colleges, of those, at least, in which our secular clergy are trained. At Ushaw, and I believe at Oscott, the same distinction does not exist so far as regards the association of the students, although every where, I apprehend, the line of demarcation between allowed and forbidden books is drawn much more tightly than your correspondent appears to think expedient.

"X. Y. Z." should have known, therefore, that as to the question of united or separate education, he has great authorities, even among Catholics, on his side. My own bias, I confess, is in favour of the Old-Hall practice; it may be because I have been to some extent personally conversant with its working and results. I could even desire that our ecclesiastics were educated in separate colleges altogether. Having, however, no right to a voice in the matter, this wish is simply inoperative. But, as I have undertaken to meet your correspondent on the common ground of open and public discussion, I will go on to give my reasons for this conclusion *valeant quantum*.

So far as I am able to penetrate the mind of your correspondent on this whole matter, I seem to recognise an essential difference between him and myself. It appears to me, under correction, that there is absolutely no parallel whatsoever between the case of the Catholic priest and that of the Protestant minister. In the first place, I am unable to go the whole length of his opinion as to the amount of moral and social influence possessed by the Anglican clergy. I think he overrates it. But whatever it be, either in amount or in value, it seems to me to arise from causes, some of which are incompatible with the circumstances of the priest, *qua* he is a devoted priest, others with his circumstances, *qua* he is a priest at all. The light and easy burden which sits for the most part upon the Anglican minister, leaves him abundant leisure to act upon society (whether for good or evil) by means of personal and merely social intercourse. If he be not "addicted to Popery," but a "sensible practical man, without crotchets," he may skim over the whitening crops of the pastoral field, or the surges of this troubled ocean of a world, with the light step of a Camilla; and it may be said of him,

"Ille vel intactæ segetis per summa volaret  
Gramina, nec teneras cursu læsisset aristas;  
Vel, mare per medium, fluctu suspensus in alto,  
Ferret iter, celeres nec tingeret æquore plantas."

Far be it from me to depreciate the labours of many of the Anglican clergy, which are an example to ourselves. But I believe that, just in the degree in which they approximate to Catholic priests, either in the amount of ministerial labour, or in a just estimate



of the sacredness of the sacerdotal character, their social influence, at least, is likely to be diminished, or narrowed within a very limited sphere.

But there is one characteristic of every Catholic priest, as such, which operates as a most serious drawback upon that peculiar influence which is at the command of every sectarian minister—the rule of celibacy. Take from a clergyman, even of the Establishment, all the moral and social power over others which is directly or indirectly connected with the allowance of marriage, and how great an inroad will you not make into his popularity! How very much of public consideration does he not gain from being “marriageable,” how much more from being married! Let it but be surmised that he is an “incorrigible bachelor” (and what bachelor-clergyman is hopelessly incorrigible?), and straightway people will begin to find out that there is something perverse and unsocial about him. Again, how much of the (really valuable) “moral” influence of the Anglican clergy depends upon the amiable ministrations of the wife and daughters, though too often, as we know, counteracted by the libertinism of the sons. Here there is a most important cause of influence in the Protestant minister, from which a priest, whether such in fact or but *in voto*, is wholly debarred.

Indeed, I cannot help expressing some surprise that so acute an observer and so good a logician as your correspondent should not have felt it necessary, if it were but for the purposes of his argument, to advert in some way to the subject of clerical celibacy. In discussing the merits of the next question which he raises, that of restricted or more indiscriminate reading at college, some notice of this topic seems to be absolutely imperative. An ecclesiastical vocation is a rare and most precious gift of God. Moreover, like others among His best gifts, it hangs upon most precarious conditions. It is fragile as crystal, and tender as a leaf of the sensitive plant. And the part in which it is weakest and most susceptible during the years of its nursing, is this of the celibacy which it involves. A whole host of attractive anticipations which, in other cases, so far from being unlawful, are not unfrequently even valuable, as a preservative from sin, are to the ecclesiastic forbidden ground. The temptation to indulge in them has to be resisted by him like temptations to sin. How, under these circumstances, it could be safe to extend the range of general reading in the case of ecclesiastical students (for in that of secular students I am disposed to agree with your correspondent) to all books which are not positively immoral, I own I cannot understand. No doubt the strictest discipline and the most careful vigilance, as “X. Y. Z.” observes, may be defeated by a student who is bent on reading forbidden books; but then, one would hope that the moral training, without which all discipline must be useless, would be adequate, as a general rule, to the prevention of such an evil. Any how, this is a sort of argument which proves too much, and would go the length of discouraging the prohibition even of worse books.

Your correspondent thinks that Catholic preaching would benefit greatly by a larger infusion of a secular element. For my own part, I should be inclined to look for this most desirable result to a deeper and more ardent study of dogmatic theology. As to the varied reading, from which your correspondent thinks that Protestant preaching derives its superior interest (to myself, however, that preaching, with the exception of the sermons of those who have become Catholics, and a very few others, always appeared dull and superficial to the last degree), I am myself very doubtful how far such reading is compatible with the requisite attention to theology and its auxiliary studies, not to speak of the restricted capacities of the human mind, which can hardly feel an equal *attrait* to theology and secular learning, and whose powers of apprehension depend so largely upon the interest it can throw into the matter before it. Life, at least college-life, is too short for every thing we might desire to include in it. For my own part, I am not sanguine even as to the probability of classical literature being ever studied in Catholic seminaries to any great advantage. The value of such literature is far less in the amount of actual knowledge it confers, than in the habit of mind it tends to create. If classical literature be not loved, it will soon be dropped, especially by the hard-working priest; and loved it can scarcely be without an amount of labour and an intensity of interest which the conditions of ecclesiastical education render both impossible and undesirable. Hence I should like to see the accurate study and colloquial practice of modern languages (French more especially) substituted for extensive classical reading, with the exception always of Latin, a command of which, in writing and speaking, is absolutely necessary among the accomplishments of a priest.

We now pass by a natural transition, to the very important question of direct personal *surveillance* out of study-time. There are two opposite theories on this subject current at the present time, which I will endeavour to state as fairly as possible to both sides. According to the one, it is said that you can hardly begin too soon with trusting boys to themselves; that, by constantly haunting them with masters and monitors, you run risk of a mere "eye-service;" blunt, and gradually destroy, self-respect and the feeling of responsibility, and incur the danger of a terrible reaction when the habitual *surveillance* yields, as yield it must in the natural course of things, to an independence of visible restraint. According to the opposite view, which I need not say is that adopted and acted upon in our Catholic colleges, it is felt to be a great matter if we can secure innocence, at least in external conduct, even for a limited time, and in an incomplete degree. It is not pretended that watching is a safeguard against all possible evil, even external evil; but still, that it certainly hinders a great deal of it; that it is a very material check, for instance, upon bad conversation, as well as upon many other dangers incidental to the free association of boys with one another; and that, considering how much of youthful sin is



traceable to these causes, such a check cannot but act well in the formation of virtuous habits. Hence it becomes even a safeguard, in one way, against the admitted dangers of reaction when liberty succeeds to control ; for habits are formed by the constant repression of temptation. Again, many a youth dies *in statu pupillari*, and thus never encounters the battle with the outer world at all. To those who are so happy, it will have proved an unspeakable gain to have been preserved any how, even from a single sin ; and by this method of restraint boys are preserved from many, even though not from all, sins. The frightful and well-authenticated stories of immorality in Protestant schools (to which many converts bear personal testimony) come strongly in aid of the established theory of discipline.

I fear I have not been able to state the case of the two sides with sufficient impartiality to conceal to which of the two I incline. It certainly appears to me, that the directors of seminaries would incur a most serious responsibility by innovating essentially or extensively upon the established method. Having said thus much, however, I will make the following reserves and admissions :

1. I must explain what I mean by *surveillance*, and what I don't mean by it. I don't mean, then, the *surveillance* of a sentinel, a turnkey, or a duenna. I mean the watchful, patient observance of a loving and sympathising eye. There are few duties of a rector of a college which require, I should imagine, greater circumspection and discrimination than the choice of those officers who are to represent him in the constant superintendence of the boys. This duty demands a very rare union of zeal and judgment, vigilance and kindness, tact and simplicity. Pope's picture of a discreet wife may serve as the description of a good Master of the Bounds, or Dormitory :

"Who, while he rules them, never shows he rules."\*

He must so temper restraint by prudence as to inspire the impression of liberty, while he maintains the reality of control. His influence should be like that of the practised host, who puts every one around him at his ease, without lowering his dignity or compromising his position. Moreover, he must have a clear insight into what he may allow and what he must repress. He must know where liberty ends and license begins, where gaiety ceases to be harmless and foibles deepen into sins. He cannot be too indulgent, so long as he does not connive at what is positively wrong. It would be hard indeed to light upon such a person by chance ; but I suppose he is not hard to find in colleges where a thoroughly right spirit has grown up.

\* As an example of the opposite kind of *surveillance*, I may mention the practice of some French schools, as related to me by an eye-witness. The presiding master, during the play-hours, is perched up at a high desk, whence his vigilant eye scans, with inevitable penetration, the busy scene around him. A poor youth, forgetting himself for the moment, indulges in some forbidden gambol, but is instantly recalled to a sense of duty by the shrill voice from the pulpit, "Monsieur, quatre pages d'histoire!"

2. It would seem best that, as the course of a student proceeds, direct *surveillance* should be gradually relaxed, and more and more room given to the sense of personal responsibility. I certainly do think it an evil that the passage from the state of *surveillance* to that of entire personal freedom should be too abrupt, and a young man thrown as it were head and shoulders into the responsibilities of a town mission without any previous training in the habits of self-reliance.

3. Where the stricter system of discipline prevails, it ought, surely, to be maintained *without interruption*. If, for instance, young men are allowed to go where they like, and do as they like, in vacation time, certainly I think it would be better if they were left more to themselves at college. If you mean to trust to their power of self-government at particular seasons, it would seem better to train them to the practice of it at other times. The most desirable arrangement, and one which I wish could be generally adopted, would seem to be that of country-houses in connection with the colleges, at which students might enjoy the advantage of change of air, scene, and occupation, without being removed from the discipline to which they are subjected at college.

4. But the only real security, after all, against the evil of an excessive reliance upon external and merely temporary aids, is to be found in constant moral and religious training. The critical time in a young man's life when he is to be no longer "under tutors and governors," but thrown upon conscience and the simple thought of the Unseen but All-seeing Eye, should, I suppose, be repeatedly, or rather incessantly anticipated in sermons, in private exhortations, and—though last, not least—in the still more persuasive form of easy and informal conversation. I could fancy that a wise superior would even make it his especial business to explain to the students the real purpose of this probationary discipline, to point out its ends and obviate its deficiencies.

I pass at length, with real satisfaction, to that portion of your correspondent's letter in which I am able to feel that we are entirely and cordially at one. I know too little of the interior of Catholic colleges and schools to pronounce upon the extent to which what he happily calls the "police system" prevails over the confidential. All I can say from experience is, that when I was myself at St. Edmund's twelve or thirteen years ago, it could not be said with truth that discipline was carried out to an extreme, or in a stern and unamiable spirit. My kind friend Dr. Cox, who was at that time president, was the very embodiment of human kindness; and I say it in his praise, and not to his discredit, that in all my life I never met with a man who would have made a worse policeman.

Thus I am relieved from the painful necessity of treating the interesting question your correspondent has opened otherwise than hypothetically; and as I am dealing with liabilities only, and not with admitted facts, I can speak with all the greater freedom. Let me say, then, that I agree in every word which "X. Y. Z." has



written in favour of eliciting and cultivating the affections, as an integral part of all moral tuition ; of dealing with boys and young men as individuals, almost indefinitely different in character and capability, and of making that personal individuality which belongs to each one of us the basis of the moral superstructure which is to be raised upon it. I believe "X. Y. Z." to be entirely right, and to put forth a great truth, when he says that the triumph of Divine grace is the sanctification of the individual character, and not the creation of any common character into which the original and significant distinctions of nature are absorbed and lost. The characteristic varieties of the saints, and, as your correspondent justly observes, of none more than the Apostles themselves, place this view of the case beyond a doubt.

If all this be so, it follows that a more fatal error cannot be committed in education than to deal with its subjects upon a hard regimental principle. It follows also that to ignore instead of managing, to crush instead of educing, training, and directing the natural affections, is even to outrage God's work, and, as it were, affront His image. Not so, as might be abundantly shown, did our Lord, nor St. John the beloved disciple, nor St. Paul. I have heard of its having been even said that "a strong and decided development of natural affection is a disqualification for the priesthood." The sentiment is so odious, as well as so paradoxical, that I doubt its having ever been broached, and I quote it merely as a way of giving shape to the opinion which your correspondent has so well combated. On the contrary, I know of no gift which should be more highly prized in a priest than that of a warm and susceptible heart, and this all the rather because some of the tendencies of his state, if left to themselves, might operate in a contrary direction. The constant familiarity with scenes of sorrow has a natural, though not a necessary, tendency to harden the heart. The severance of family ties is another trial to the priest, especially if not living in community. Yet, despite all natural disadvantages, the priest is habitually called upon, not to *affect*, or merely *profess*, sympathy with every form of human sorrow, but to *feel*, in some real way, the miseries of others ; and my own belief is, that the circumstances of his state, so far from being *necessarily* (as Protestants allege) adverse to sympathy, may become, with proper care, even favourable to it. We are all acquainted with priests so happily constituted or disposed, as to be able to throw themselves into each special case of (real) distress which comes before them with a power of personal appropriation which seems rather to grow than to decline by habitual exercise. I am sure that there are also those on whom the sacrifice of domestic endearments has no other effect than to open their hearts all the more affectionately upon those spiritual children whom God has given them in the place of natural relations. Yet further, I think I also know some who love their natural relations none the worse, and perhaps all the better, for acting habitually upon the obligations of their state. For it is the peculiar attribute of Christian charity,

as distinguished from human love, that concentration tends, as in the case of sun-light, not to the absorption, but to the diffusion of its beams. Hence the truth which your correspondent has so well pointed out, that it is through the exercise (of course regulated) of special affection that the habit of charity is fostered ; and, *vice versa*, that those who make a point of stifling special affection, on the plea of cultivating general benevolence, usually end in looking upon all mankind with equal indifference.

Heartily, therefore, do I unite with him in hoping that the time may never come when it could be truly said to our students, "Si decem millia pædagogorum habeatis, sed non multos patres." Those who are to act towards others in a fatherly spirit, must themselves have been in youth the objects of a fatherly care. Indeed, if any modification of this spirit in the government of youth has to be sought, it must be looked for in the characteristic tenderness of the other parent rather than in the mechanical discipline of the pedagogue. It is said that the ministerial gentleness of St. Edmund of Canterbury is to be traced principally to the fact of his having fallen in his youth under the care of a wise and affectionate mother.

With a larger infusion of the parental spirit will necessarily disappear all those artificial modes of government which used to prevail with such fatal results in the Protestant schools and monasteries, but which are gradually giving way to the good sense of the age. I refer, of course, to what is expressively called "humbug" in all its various branches. With this affectionate spirit will vanish also those miserable errors and subterfuges in the management of boys and young men, the only effect of which is to raise up a prolific crop of young hypocrites. Such are, *inter alia*, slyness, the affectation of knowledge, and the use of misplaced raillery. No man is a hero to his children any more than to his *valet de chambre*, and we had better all of us give up the attempt to appear so. Acting a part is a course which is sure to break down in the long-run, and great is the fall therefrom. The only successful basis of all government (the government of youth especially) is CONFIDENCE ; and confidence, while it will survive the shock of occasional disedification, is sure to be stifled in the grasp of habitual constraint.

Your obedient servant,

F.

---



## Literary Notices.

*The Gregorian Hymns for Vespers (according to the Mechlin edition of the Roman Vespers), reduced to Time, and harmonised in Four Parts.* By the Rev. W. J. Dolan. (London: Burns.) The reason which has induced the editor of this arrangement of the hymns, whom we must congratulate on the general excellence and scientific value of his harmonies, to reduce them to common musical measure, is because, when there are no bars, there are various ways in which the notes may be grouped and the phrases accentuated; so that unless there is a perfect understanding between the singers, they cannot keep together. Mr. Dolan meets the difficulty by reducing all the hymns to "Time." The hymn-tunes being set to verse, that is, to a known rhythmical sequence of accentuated and unaccentuated syllables, must themselves have such a rhythm, and this rhythm may be expressed by the common divisions into bars. Not that Mr. Dolan wishes it to be understood that his barring is the only one right or possible; he only wishes by them to point out *one* mode in which an intelligent musician might naturally sing the plain-chant hymns from the plain-chant notes.

In general, we think it a great mistake to attempt any metrical adaptation of the plain-chant; it shows that the adapter scarcely recognises the difference between the rhythm of oratory and the rhythm of music. Declamation cannot be measured by the beats of a metronome, or by the sequences of accents in a bar; it depends on the sense or the articulate sound of the words or syllables. The plain-chant seems intended to preserve this declamatory rhythm; and therefore any metrical arrangement goes far to destroy its distinctive character. And when thus arranged, the hymns must either be sung strictly by the bars, or not strictly. If strictly, their character is lost; if not strictly, the difficulty which was intended to be avoided again emerges; for it will require even greater understanding among the singers to feel a *tempo rubato* in barred music than to feel the declamatory accent of the unbarred plain-song. And Mr. Dolan seems to land his singers precisely in this difficulty when he tells them to sing his hymns "freely, without *too* rigid an adherence to the time." Again, the barring of melodies is intended to govern both the groupings and the accentuation of notes. But, in matter of fact, Mr. Dolan's barring sometimes governs neither, as in the hymn at p. 41, where the notes are so disposed as to show bars within bars, and where the accentuation proves that the signature  $\frac{5}{2}$  is a mere delusion; as he has grouped the notes, the real rhythm is  $\frac{3}{2}$  for one bar,  $\frac{2}{2}$  or  $\text{C}$  for one bar,  $\frac{3}{2}$  again for one bar, the line concluding with a minim, or  $\frac{1}{2}$  bar. The second line would be the same. As the barring now stands, the bars not only cut

across groups of notes which ought to be sung together, but the accentuation varies with every line, and is generally wrong.

Mr. Dolan was struggling almost with an impossibility, unless he had recourse to the artifice of changing his signature almost with each bar ; but then he would have only introduced new difficulties instead of the old. We are sure that, in spite of all attempts, it will remain best to sing and play the plain-chant from plain-chant books ; and organists who are not competent to put harmonies extempore will scarcely play Mr. Dolan's excellent but difficult harmonies properly. Good organists will not be tied down to them, and bad organists will not be able to play them. We must once more bear our testimony to the learning, patience, and skill which Mr. Dolan's arrangements exhibit ; only we think that we perceive in them the amateur's foible of sometimes seeking for novelty, and avoiding common chords where common chords would come in with better effect. On the other hand, we have noticed one place where common, not to say namby-pamby, harmonies disguised a passage which afforded a tempting opportunity for a bold musician.

*Seven Years' Residence in the Great Deserts of North America.* By the Abbé Em. Domenech. 2 vols. (London : Longmans.) It is a pity that the translator of this excellent book should make us wish we had the French rather than the English before us. Under such manipulation the most lively stories become somewhat dull reading. After discounting this defect on the translator's part, and after noting the fact that the Abbé is sadly to seek on some scientific subjects on which he feels bound to communicate his observations, because there is no one more competent who has been over the same ground ; and also that he is given to speculate in a singularly old-fashioned manner on certain questions of origins of races and languages, where, indeed, the uncertainty of our knowledge opens a wide gate for all manner of dreams ;—after noting these drawbacks, we have nothing but unqualified praise for the writings of a man who, while devoting his life to a labour of love among the poor people he describes, could have his eyes open to their peculiarities, could store his memory with all that he saw, and could tell what he remembered with such liveliness. Not that the book is a lively one on the whole : the Abbé Domenech probably knows more about these North-American Indians than any one in Europe, and in these volumes he seeks to tell all he knows of them and of their country ; so we have disquisitions on all kinds of things upon which it would be impossible to write in a lively manner. But the book is a good one in spite of the translator, and should be in the hands of every one interested in ethnology.

---



## Current Events.

### HOME AFFAIRS.

#### *National Defences.*

THE Royal Commissioners appointed last autumn to consider the defences of the United Kingdom, have reported their conviction, both on military and financial grounds, that neither our fleet, our regular army, nor our volunteer forces, nor even the three combined, can be relied on as sufficient in themselves for the security of the kingdom against foreign invasion. At the same time, they fully recognise the immense importance of the Channel as a first line of defence, and of a Channel fleet to maintain it; and starting from this recognition, they proceed to urge the primary necessity of protecting the dockyards and arsenals which serve as the base of our naval operations, and without which a single disaster might annihilate our naval power. This protection they think cannot be given effectually by the fleet itself, which has other and more appropriate duties to perform; nor can it, any more than the general defence of the country, be safely intrusted to the small bodies of troops which, in case of an invasion, we should now be able to devote to it.

If we met the difficulty by increasing our army, we should have to do so at an immediate cost of 111*l.* a man for enlistment expenses and the necessary increase of barrack accommodation, besides an annual outlay of 60*l.* or 70*l.* a man for pay, provision, clothing, barrack repairs, pensions, &c. So that, if we merely doubled the number of regular troops actually at home, viz. 66,000, exclusive of the Indian depôts, we should have at once to provide 8,000,000*l.*, besides adding 4,000,000*l.* a year to our ordinary liabilities.

As an alternative to this expenditure, the commissioners propose a system of fortifications, which they are of opinion will be more effectual as well as cheaper. These fortifications would involve an outlay, once for all, of 10,390,000*l.*, besides a small

annual charge for maintenance, and would include the protection of those vital points at which an enemy would strike, and of harbours whose possession would give him sure bases of operation in positions favourable to his design. The royal dockyards, Woolwich arsenal, Portland, Dover, and Cork, are the stations which the commissioners refer to these two heads: the defence of London and of our commercial ports they do not consider within the scope of their instructions.

For the permanent defence of the stations indicated against attacks by sea, the commissioners recommend the adoption of advanced works, consisting either of open batteries secured against a *coup-de-main* by a tower or defensible barrack in their rear, or of casemated batteries, according to local circumstances; and they suggest, for the same purpose, the use of an improved floating battery, which is described as a powerful iron-sided steam-vessel, capable alike of maintaining a fixed station or manœuvring in a general engagement, of sufficient size to afford a steady platform for working the guns, yet not so large as to be unmanageable in narrow waters, mounting from twelve to twenty guns, having a speed of from eight to ten knots, and of as light a draught of water as is consistent with other good qualities.

The land defences are considered with the twofold view of providing against bombardment and capture. To gain the first end, the commissioners conceive that, in cases where the nature of the country would admit of the enemy's obtaining a full view of the object of attack, within practicable range (*i. e.* about 8000 yards), it is necessary to establish defences so as to command the ground within that limit; but that wherever the object of attack is screened from view by hills, there is no necessity for occupying any position beyond the features of ground which afford

such cover. To gain the second, they recommend that the works should be so designed as to be capable of being defended by a small body of men against a *coup-de-main*; but that they should, at the same time, have capabilities of resistance that will enable them to withstand any attack likely to be brought against them. With this view, they should be provided with redoubts at their gorge, by means of which an enemy would be prevented from holding the work, if he should succeed in obtaining partial possession of it. The main ramparts should be capable of affording a heavy fire of artillery and musketry in those directions over which an

enemy must make his approach; and bomb-proof cover should be provided for the garrison. In situations where the ditches can be filled with water, no revetment need be constructed; but wherever this is not the case, they should either have escarps and counterscarps, or detached walls of masonry, and in either case they should be flanked both by artillery and musketry.

The following statement shows in tabular form the number of guns, amount of barrack accommodation, and estimated expense of all the works recommended by the commission, together with similar information respecting those in progress:

STATIONS.	Guns.		Barrack accommodation, chiefly Bomb-proof.		Expense of Works, including purchase of Land.	
	No.	Total No.	No. of Men.	Total No.	—	Total.
<i>Portsmouth and Isle of Wight:</i>					£	£
Recommended by Royal Commission . . . .	987	..	7,320	..	2,400,000	
In works in progress . .	280	..	1,500	..	400,000	
<i>Plymouth:</i>		1,267		8,820		2,800,000
Recommended by R. C. .	742	..	7,010	..	2,670,000	
In works in progress . .	120	..	1,000	..	350,000	
<i>Pembroke:</i>		862		8,010		3,020,000
Recommended by R. C. .	163	..	1,700	..	600,000	
In works in progress . .	150	..	1,000	..	165,000	
<i>Portland:</i>		313		2,700		765,000
Recommended by R. C. .	..	..	..	..	*250,000	
In works in progress . .	300	..	2,300	..	380,000	
<i>Thames:</i>		300		2,300		630,000
Recommended by R. C. .	110	110	1,100	1,100	180,000	180,000
<i>Medway and Sheerness:</i>						
Recommended by R. C. .	204	204	1,400	1,400	450,000	450,000
<i>Chatham:</i>						
Recommended by R. C. .	335	335	3,550	3,550	1,350,000	1,350,000
<i>Woolwich:</i>						
Recommended by R. C. .	150	150	1,500	1,500	700,000	700,000
<i>Dover:</i>						
Recommended by R. C. .	30	..	300	..	170,000	
In works in progress . .	60	..	300	..	165,000	
<i>Cork:</i>		90		600		335,000
Recommended by R. C. .	90	90	600	600	120,000	120,000
Total guns and barracks .	3,721		30,580			
Armament of works recommended by R. C. . . .	..	..	..	..	..	500,000
Floating defences . . . .	..	..	..	..	..	1,000,000
Total estimate of expense .	..	..	..	..	..	11,850,000

\* 100,000*l.* for purchase of land, and 150,000*l.* for works already projected.



It is proposed that these works should be manned, to a large extent, by the infantry of the line and militia, the local artillery militia, the pensioners, and the artillery volunteer corps. And their number and extent, therefore, has not been determined by any reference to the actual or probable strength of the Royal Artillery. To carry out the entire scheme, it would be necessary to purchase about 10,500 acres of land, about 1500 of which would be occupied by the works, and the rest would become a source of revenue to the extent of about 25,000*l.* a year. 2500 pieces of artillery would be required besides those which are actually mounted, or which had been already demanded for works sanctioned before the commissioners drew up their report. All such works have now received their express approval, and are of course incorporated in their general scheme of defence.

The Government having determined that our store of materials of war should no longer be concentrated in one place, the question of the choice of a site for the new dépôt was referred to the commissioners, and is discussed in a correspondence appended to their report. Weedon, which had been recommended for the purpose by a previous commission, is now stated to be unfavourably situated, for defence; and from the "many more eligible places" which they think might be found, the commissioners select Cannock Chase, in the middle of Staffordshire. They add a suggestion for the formation, under certain circumstances, of another arsenal on the western sea-board at a spot in the neighbourhood of Birkenhead.

On the 23d July, Lord Palmerston brought the whole subject before the House of Commons in committee by moving the following resolution: "That it is the opinion of this Committee, that towards providing for the construction of works for the defence of the royal dockyards and arsenals, and of the ports of Dover and Portland, and for the creation of a central arsenal, a sum not exceeding 2,000,000*l.* be charged on the consolidated fund of the United Kingdom, and that the Commissioners of her Majesty's Treasury be authorised

and empowered to raise the said sum by annuities for a time not exceeding thirty years, such annuities also to be charged upon the consolidated fund."

Insisting with unusual plainness and force on the necessity of our being prepared for a war with France, Lord Palmerston maintained the substantial adoption of the commissioners' proposals to be absolutely essential for the safety of the country. As the contemplated works, if required at all, were obviously required at once, he proposed to take measures for completing them in the course of three or four years, the shortest period within which it would be possible to do so; and he thought that by raising the money as it was wanted, on terminable annuities running for thirty years, the requisite despatch would be secured; while the country would not have to bear a much heavier burden than would be incurred by spreading the works over eighteen or twenty years, and waiting to undertake each till the slow process of annual votes brought in the money that might be necessary. With regard to the amount, he explained that the outlay for floating defences would be included in the annual estimates, and that guns would be forthcoming in the ordinary course as fast as the works became ready to receive them; so that 1,500,000*l.* might be deducted from the special estimate of 10,390,000*l.*, leaving about 9,000,000*l.* only to be provided for. Of this, the Government was of opinion that 2,000,000*l.* was as much as could be advantageously expended within the next twelve months, so that it was not necessary to ask for more than that amount during the present session; and it would afterwards rest with the Government of the day to apply to Parliament for such successive portions of the 9,000,000*l.* as might be found necessary in the course of each successive year. The design was to put the money thus raised into a separate account, by means of an Appropriation Act, and to have an annual statement laid before Parliament for each instalment. Till 1867 the annuities on which the money was to be raised would be an additional charge on the country; but in that year an an-

nual payment of 580,000*l.* would fall in by the extinction of the terminable annuities of 1823, and this 580,000*l.* would from that time more than cover the interest to be paid on the 9,000,000*l.*

From a subsequent statement of Mr. Sidney Herbert's, it appeared that the works which the Government proposed to commence this year would involve for their completion an expenditure of about 5,000,000*l.*, though only the 2,000,000*l.* would be actually laid out within the twelve months. Of this 2,000,000*l.*, 540,000*l.* is for Portsmouth, 300,000*l.* for Plymouth, 130,000*l.* for Pembroke, 180,000*l.* for the Thames, Medway, and Chatham, and 20,000*l.* for Cork. But it is to be divided in larger or smaller sums among all the stations pointed out by the commissioners, and a schedule is to be laid before Parliament showing the distribution in detail.

In the adjourned debate, Mr. Lindsay moved an amendment to the effect that, "As the main defence of Great Britain against aggression depends on an efficient navy, it is not now expedient to enter into a large expenditure on permanent land fortification." Mr. Bright pointed out that, although the creation of a central arsenal was included in the Government resolution, the cost of it was not included in the estimate of 9,000,000*l.*; and after complaining that the proposed works would ultimately involve the expense of a large addition to the regular army, he went on to review, in a strain of elaborate and bitter irony, the various schemes of national defence which have recently been published by private individuals, as well as the proposals and proceedings of the Royal Commission. But beyond this there was no serious opposition to the Government resolution, which was carried by 268 for to 39 against.

#### *Privilege of the House of Commons.*

On the 29th of June, Mr. Walpole brought up the report of the Select Committee appointed by the House of Commons to search for precedents bearing on the rejection of the Paper Duties Abolition Bill by the House of Lords; and on 5th July Lord

Palmerston, on behalf of the Government, moved the following resolutions, which were ultimately adopted: "1. That the right of granting aids and supplies to the Crown is in the Commons alone, as an essential part of their constitution, and the limitation of all such grants as to the matter, manner, measure, and time, is only in them. 2. That, although the Lords have exercised the power of rejecting bills of several descriptions relating to taxation, by negating the whole, yet the exercise of that power by them has not been frequent, and is justly regarded by this House with peculiar jealousy, as affecting the right of the Commons to grant the supplies, and to provide the ways and means for the service of the year. 3. That to guard for the future against an undue exercise of that power by the Lords, and to secure to the Commons their rightful control over taxation and supply, this House has in its own hands the power so to impose and remit taxes and frame bills of supply, that the right of the Commons, as to the matter, manner, measure, and time, shall be maintained inviolate."

As the Committee confined their report to a mere enumeration of precedents, without offering any opinion or making any comments upon them, the force and bearing of the various facts adduced by them must be estimated by the help of broader and less cautious authorities. The House of Commons, by virtue of its privilege, lays claim to the exclusive power of imposing and remitting taxes; and this claim is always so far recognised that the Sovereign addresses the Commons alone on the question of supply, and thanks them alone for supplies at the end of the session. But the taxing and legislative functions are of course distinct from one another; and the House of Lords as distinctly claims an unlimited participation in the latter as the House of Commons asserts an exclusive right in the former. Each stands on its own ground, and regards the double question as one whole from its own point of view—the House of Commons bent on reserving to itself the integrity of the taxing power; the House of Lords careful to prevent the Commons from



dealing with matters of general legislation under cover of money-bills. Each, indeed, extends its assertion of privilege beyond the limit of its substantial rights; but it only does so in order to defend those rights more effectually, and is patient of contradiction outside their sphere so long as they themselves remain intact. And thus,—the House of Commons formally claiming every thing, and the House of Lords formally conceding nothing,—there has grown up between them a constitutional practice which endorses the extreme theory of neither, while it secures the real aim of both. According to this practice, it rests with the Commons alone to initiate money-bills, whether for the imposition or repeal of taxes; and the Lords do not amend any such bill except by the correction of mere clerical errors, by trifling alterations in furtherance of its intent and object, or by striking out or modifying some clause which, though appended to the bill, is foreign to its real matter. Similarly, when a money-bill has involved any question of general policy, such as protection, religious freedom, and the like, the Lords have held themselves entitled to reject it on grounds appropriate to that question, and the Commons have acquiesced in the rejection. But the cases in which this has occurred are far less frequent than those in which amendments have been allowed; and no instance has been found in which the Lords have rejected a simple money-bill on purely financial grounds, under the impression that it was their duty to square the income and expenditure of the year. Such an instance would be the only complete precedent for the course pursued with regard to the Paper Duties Abolition Bill; and the act of throwing out the bill must therefore be admitted to have been, whether justifiable or not, an innovation on the existing constitutional usage.

Nor can the change be considered an unimportant one. It is argued on behalf of the Lords that their interposition, if irregular, was at all events beneficial, inasmuch as it preserved a certain item of the revenue of the year which the Commons had imprudently agreed to sacrifice. This

may be so; but if the imprudence of one House, judged by the other, is to be the measure of that other's allowable intervention, then there is an end of settled right on both sides, and no reason exists any longer why the Lords should not originate money-bills as well as amend and reject them. Besides which, it is necessary to show, in order to the validity of the argument, not only that the sacrifice of the paper duty was unwise, but also that there was no remedy which could serve as an alternative to the prevention exercised by the Lords, no equivalent derivable from some other source for the Commons to devote to the public service. Now, in one way, such an equivalent had already been granted, because the annual budget proceeds on a balance of imposition and repeal of taxes, so that the revenue of each year is voted in part on the faith of the concurrent remission, and the two combined in one scheme form the complement of each other. And, apart from this consideration, if at any time the calculations on which the budget is framed turn out to be erroneous, or if circumstances afterwards arise to disturb the equilibrium of income and expenditure, it is always as much in the power of the Commons to restore the balance as it was originally to adjust it, by granting whatever additional revenue may be necessary, without any extraordinary intervention on the part of the other House. Moreover, the act of the Lords in this case tends not merely to vindicate for them a share in the taxing power, but virtually, within the limits of that act, to transfer it to them altogether. For the yearly estimates, being originally prepared by command of the Crown, and laid by its ministers before the House of Commons, go up from that House with the joint sanction of two branches of the legislature; and the final act being thus in the Lords, their reversal of the decision of the Commons is equivalent to their assuming the sole responsibility of the position in which they leave the question. So that if, as in the present case, they decide against the remission of a tax which the Crown and the House of Commons propose to them to remit, the tax

comes to be levied by their act and deed, and virtually the supply is granted by them alone, in spite of the House of Commons.

How far the resolutions carried by Government really satisfy the emergency, may perhaps admit of question. They contain, no doubt, a distinct declaration of the rights of the House of Commons with regard to money-bills; and it may be conceded to Mr. Gladstone that, "as far as words go," they are sufficient. But it matters little that "this House has in its own hands the power so to impose and remit taxes, and frame bills of supply, that the right of the Commons, as to the matter, manner, measure, and time, shall be maintained inviolate," if the power remains unexercised and the bills are not so framed. It is one thing for the Lower House to enter on a formal conflict with the Lords about an act which is done and over, another thing to take the necessary precautions against the recurrence of such an act in future.

#### *The Religious Census.*

In compliance with the wish of the Dissenters, the Government have modified their Census Bill by withdrawing the provision for a return of religious profession. On 11th July, Mr. Baines moved the omission of the clause, and stated at some length the case of the Dissenters. They were not, he said, ashamed of avowing their religious persuasion, nor did they fear the results of the proposed enumeration; but they deemed it a duty to resist an authoritative demand on the part of the Government upon a point which they regarded as beyond the legitimate scope of civil interference. A more inapplicable argument it would perhaps be difficult to frame; and Mr. Baines himself effectually disposed of it by referring to the fact, that Government were actually prepared to withdraw the penalty attached to a refusal of the return so far as the religious part of it was concerned. The penalty being removed, the demand would cease to be, in any strict or objectionable sense, an authoritative one; and it is something more than difficult to understand the scruple which pre-

vents a man from designating himself in a census paper by the title which he spontaneously adopts on every other occasion. Sir George Lewis dwelt on the obvious inconsistency of people who, under the very name of Protestant Dissenters, petitioned the House against being forced for once to call themselves so, and withdrew the clause with a recommendation to the objectors to reconsider their position during the next ten years, "not upon grounds of instinct and sentiment, but upon argumentative and rational grounds;" in which case he trusted that the progress of inquiry and intelligence would lead to the removal of prejudices which at the present moment were invincible.

Those who cannot share so cheerful a conviction, will at least desire to find their own anticipations deceived. Under the strong and growing pressure of popular intolerance, one's first sympathies are naturally with any minority asserting what they conceive to be a principle; but if the Dissenters have done more in this case than merely set up what they hoped other people would take for a principle, they have been far less fortunate in their advocate than we are at present willing to consider them. Mr. Baines is no doubt quite correct in saying that a large number of persons who habitually attend the worship of the Establishment in the morning, and that of the Dissenters in the evening, would find a theoretical difficulty in determining under what particular class of Protestants to rank themselves. But when he goes on to argue against the tyrannous indelicacy of compelling men "to ask their guests and the inmates of their houses what is the religion they" *profess*, one can only marvel at the organisation by which "twenty legions" of thinking beings can be marshalled under such a banner, and maintained in their fidelity to such a cause. Happily the dissenting leaders are indifferent to the feelings of heads of families on the other side of St. George's Channel; and Mr. Monsell was able to elicit an assurance that the religious census would not be abandoned in Ireland. But for the rest of the kingdom, for the next ten years at



least, we must content ourselves with the absence of information such as Austria, Bavaria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Prussia, Saxony, Sweden, and Wirtemberg possess as a matter of course; and while we thus lag behind all the more civilised states of Europe, our Protestant Dissenters will have the comfort of knowing that we do so out of deference to their "instinctive feelings."

### *Indian Legislation.*

The Government have introduced and carried an important measure of Indian legislation, for the amalgamation of the European forces with the regular army.

The European forces of the late East India Company, transferred to the Crown in 1858, amounted to about 24,000 men; but, in consequence of the recent discontents arising out of the transfer, nearly half of that number have taken their discharge, and the force at present amounts to little more than 12,000 men. It is agreed on all hands, however, that a European army of 40,000 men must be maintained in India; and the question therefore arises whether the remainder of them should be raised exclusively for Indian service, under the old Act, or simply added together with the existing 12,000 to the regular army, so as to abolish all distinction between what have hitherto been the two forces.

A royal commission, appointed in 1858 to consider generally the organisation of the Indian army, split into two parties. A majority, consisting of five officers of the regular army, were in favour of the amalgamation; a minority, consisting of four officers of the Indian army, were against it; and as the same peculiarity characterised the evidence,—that of old Queen's officers tending in one direction, and that of old Company's officers in the other,—neither side had a clear advantage in point of authority. Lord Derby's Indian and war ministers, following the same rule of contrariety, were opposed to each other on the question; and his government arranged a compromise by which a local army was to be maintained to the extent of two-fifths of the whole number of European troops required.

This settlement was at first accepted by the present Government; and Sir Charles Wood, in now proposing to supersede it, represents himself as having yielded an unwilling assent to the force of argument and reason. The outline of his plan is, that the European regiments in India should form part of the Queen's regular army, the existing officers retaining their position, rising by seniority, as they do now; that officers should be eligible for general service, rising by seniority to the rank of captain, and afterwards, by selection, to the rank of major and lieutenant-colonel; that the existing officers of the Indian army should be employed, either as they now are in the regular regiments, or in various situations on the staff; and that ultimately vacancies in the staff-corps should be filled up by candidates selected from the Queen's general army. But all that he has at present called on Parliament to do is to sanction the *principle* of amalgamation, by repealing the Act which gives authority for the raising of an exclusively Indian force; and the general features, as well as the details, of the new scheme still remain for discussion.

Great stress was laid by Sir Charles Wood, in his introductory speech, on the argument that the army in India should belong to the governing power; and he quoted a strong opinion of the Duke of Wellington's in support of his view. The proposition, as it stands, seems scarcely to need such support; but it would have been more to the purpose to show its relevancy to a question which concerns, not the already-accomplished transfer of the East India Company's troops to the Crown, but merely their claim to an organisation differing in some respects from that of other portions of the royal army. Our militia and volunteers belong to the governing power as absolutely as the regular troops, though the first can only be sent out of the kingdom under certain contingencies, and the second not at all. And it is no more an "anomaly" that India, paying for her own army, should have an exclusive right in the army for which she pays, than that our volunteers, providing themselves with the sinews of war, should reserve their strength

for the defence of their own homes. Even if it were, the entire position of India, with regard to this country, is anomalous beyond all precedent in history; and happily the passion for symmetry is not one which has ever deeply, or for long together, affected English legislation.

A better argument in favour of the amalgamation is that derived from the danger of mutinous combination. A movable force, which is constantly changing its situation, and periodically renovates itself by a return home, is obviously far less likely to endanger the public safety than one permanently located in India, and having a separate interest from the rest of the Queen's troops. Nor can the discipline of any force—the interior economy of its regiments, and the relations existing between officers and men—be subjected to a greater disadvantage than that which arises from constant service in a deteriorating climate, and habitual exemption from the supervision of the higher military authorities.

But the question does not concern the European troops in India alone. The maintenance of a native army, whether desirable or not, is an inevitable necessity, and such an army cannot be maintained in entire dissociation from the European force without its officers and men losing their self-respect and *esprit de corps*. And then, as regards our regular army, the amalgamation would of course largely increase the period of foreign service; and it is worthy of consideration how far this would not tend to deter men of social position from entering as commissioned officers, a result which is earnestly to be deprecated on political as well as military grounds. Moreover, in a country like India, it is scarcely possible to separate the officers of the army from the work of civil administration; and that work can only be carried on successfully by men who have been trained to the Indian service, who have gone to India before their ideas were formed or their habits fixed, and who have made its administration the business of their lives. Such men there can never be any certainty of finding in the regular army, nor is there much probability of it; and if the men are not in ex-

istence, it is of no present use holding out inducements to attract them. But of course it does not follow that because regimental officers have hitherto been chosen for diplomatic and other civil appointments, they must for ever continue to be so; and Sir Charles grounds his proposed staff-corps, to a large extent, on the argument that, whether the local army were maintained or not, it would be indispensably necessary to put an end to this system, and to provide officers for the civil service from a source which would not impair the efficiency of the regiments.

#### *Irish Education.*

Thursday, 16th August, the question of the education of the Catholic Irish, and the demands of the Irish Bishops, were discussed in the House of Commons. A year ago the Bishops had asked for the total abolition of the national system, and the introduction of denominational schools. Their demand was founded on the violation of the original agreement on which the national system was accepted, by the changes introduced to satisfy the Protestants. Probably it was also considered that if the original measure was a great improvement thirty years ago, the importance of Catholics in Parliament had since then increased, and a greater concession might be fairly expected. The Government had, however, replied that the national system should be unconditionally maintained, and the Catholics of Ireland waited patiently to see what would be proposed. The Catholic members of Parliament addressed a letter to Mr. Cardwell, a few days before the debate, requesting to be informed beforehand of his intentions, but no announcement was made until the evening of the 16th. Mr. Cardwell then stated, that it is the intention of Government to admit non-vested schools; to revise the books, in order that they may be in harmony with the feelings of Irishmen and Catholics; and, above all, to increase the number of Catholics on the board to an equality with the Protestants. On the last measure every thing depends, for it will be in the power of a well-constituted board to undo most of the mischief



which has been effected by the authority of the commissioners.

The defenders of the existing system, in particular the Attorney-General of Ireland, argue that it is a question of sovereignty between the State and the Catholic Church. The weakness of its adversaries has been that they failed to accept that issue, and to argue it as a question of liberty. For it is the same principle that has been discussed with so much energy in all the parliaments of countries where the Church is tolerated—at Paris, at Frankfort, and at Berlin, and every where the conclusion has been in favour of freedom against sovereignty. It is to the successful vindication of it that Belgium owes her independence.

The Church is necessarily at all times an educational institution. The school is as necessary to her as the pulpit, and the Protestant Churches can no more do without it than the Catholic. Even the Peace of Westphalia calls it *annexum exercitii religionis*, and long after the Peace of Westphalia the school remained under ecclesiastical supervision in Protestant and in Catholic countries alike. For centuries it was never discovered that education was a function of the State, and the State never attempted to educate. But when modern absolutism arose, it laid claim to every thing on behalf of the sovereign power. Commerce, industry, literature, religion, were all declared to be matters of State, and were appropriated and controlled accordingly. In the same way as all these things education belongs to the civil power, and on the same grounds with the rest it claims exemption. When the revolutionary theory of

Government began to prevail, and Church and State found that they were educating for opposite ends and in a contradictory spirit, it became necessary for the State to remove the children entirely from the influence of religion. This spirit of hostility was not, however, universal, and it was quite possible, especially in these countries, to admit the claims of the modern State without serious danger. For there are two alternatives almost equally plausible, suited to different states of society. Either the school belongs to the Church, and preserves a confessional character, where people of different religions reside together, or else the particular religious tone is completely neutralised. This can only be done with the assistance of the State, and of a State which is not involved in religious quarrels. In Prussia this is possible, for religious equality is acknowledged in government. But in Ireland the State has failed to do that which was required of it to make the national system work well. It does not stand above sectarian differences; it has not stripped off a confessional character. Instead of controlling parties, it is still the instrument of a party. It cannot escape from the fatal union with the Established Church in Ireland. Whilst that institution subsists and blights the country, the Catholics cannot place entire confidence in the State. The independence of Church and State is not enough for freedom, so long as the Government acknowledges a specifically religious character. This is the case in several German states, where a Catholic monarch is the head of a Protestant Church.

## FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

### *France and Europe.*

THE failure of the French plans at Baden not only opened the eyes of the nations to their danger, but in general led them to take precautions to meet it. An exception is the defensive alliance of Holland and Belgium, which was possible while it was doubtful whether Prussia might not

seek compensation in Luxembourg for losses on the Rhine, but which Holland now objects to as both one-sided and dangerous. But Belgium has uttered her national protest, and turned, July 21, the twenty-ninth anniversary of Leopold's accession into a demonstration in favour of its nationality. After Baden, the grateful princes of Germany invited the

Regent to complete the good work by renewal of friendly relations between Austria and Prussia; and the interview of Töplitz, July 24, was the result. That meeting produced an understanding between the two Powers, not only on German but on European questions, as the *Prussian Gazette* announced on the Sunday following, and added, "There is no doubt but that Austria will continue in the path upon which she has entered, and that she is resolved upon following her new policy, not only as regards religious questions, but also in reference to the different nationalities of the empire. Thus Austria will obtain a position which will increase her strength at home and abroad." On the other side, the Emperor, on his return to Vienna, desired that the reforms promised a year ago "should be finished and promulgated at as early a period as possible." The great reform is the power given to the Reichsrath, which will be a guarantee for a comparatively liberal policy that may lay a solid foundation for harmony between the North and the South. "Up to the present time, moreover, the whole influence of Austria has been directed to the support of the petty princes, whose subserviency was in turn secured by the unpopularity of their own administration. The people, especially in the northern states, necessarily looked for a counterpoise in Prussia, so that the natural rivalry of the two great monarchies was sustained and embittered by a permanent and growing divergence of internal policy." Austria, moreover, seems to have relinquished her idea of asking Germany to guarantee her non-German provinces. But in case of Austria and Italy going to war for the possession of Venetia, Austria would not be called upon to furnish her contingent to the federal army; and though Prussia would not interfere while Austria and Italy are the only belligerents, she would help Austria as soon as any other power joined in the fray.

The unexpected union of Germany, combined with the immense difficulty which the Emperor of the French found in coming to terms with the English Government about intervention in Syria, and possibly

some obscure hope of playing into the hands of Mr. Bright, in his opposition to our fortification scheme, induced Napoleon III. to write the following letter to the English nation, sent under cover to the French ambassador in London:

"St. Cloud, 25th July 1860.

"My dear Persigny,—Affairs appear to me to be so complicated—thanks to the mistrust excited everywhere since the war in Italy—that I write to you in the hope that a conversation, in perfect frankness, with Lord Palmerston will remedy the existing evil. Lord Palmerston knows me, and when I affirm a thing he will believe me. Well, you can tell him from me, in the most explicit manner, that since the peace of Villafranca I have had but one thought, one object—to inaugurate a new era of peace, and to live on the best terms with all my neighbours, and especially with England. I had renounced Savoy and Nice; the extraordinary additions to Piedmont alone caused me to resume the desire to see reunited to France provinces essentially French. But it will be objected, 'You wish for peace, and you increase immoderately the military forces of France.' I deny the fact in every sense. My army and my fleet have in them nothing of a threatening character. My steam navy is even far from being adequate to our requirements, and the number of steamers does not nearly equal that of sailing ships deemed necessary in the time of King Louis Philippe. I have 400,000 men under arms; but deduct from this amount 60,000 in Algeria, 6000 at Rome, 8000 in China, 20,000 gendarmes, the sick and the new conscripts, and you will see—what is the truth—that my regiments are of smaller effective strength than during the preceding reign. The only addition to the Army List has been made by the creation of the Imperial Guard. Moreover, while wishing for peace, I desire also to organise the forces of the country on the best possible footing; for, if foreigners have only seen the bright side of the last war, I myself, close at hand, have witnessed the defects, and I wish to remedy them. Having said thus much, I have, since



Villafranca, neither done, nor even thought, any thing which could alarm any one. When Lavalette started for Constantinople, the instructions which I gave him were confined to this: 'Use every effort to maintain the *status quo*; the interest of France is that Turkey should live as long as possible.'

"Now, then, occur the massacres in Syria, and it is asserted that I am very glad to find a new occasion of making a little war, or of playing a new part. Really, people give me credit for very little common sense. If I instantly proposed an expedition, it was because my feelings were those of the people which has put me at its head, and the intelligence from Syria transported me with indignation. My first thought, nevertheless, was to come to an understanding with England. What other interest than that of humanity could induce me to send troops into that country? Could it be that the possession of it would increase my strength? Can I conceal from myself that Algeria, notwithstanding its future advantages, is a source of weakness to France, which for thirty years has devoted to it the purest of its blood and its gold? I said it in 1852 at Bordeaux, and my opinion is still the same—I have great conquests to make, but only in France. Her interior organisation, her moral development, the increase of her resources, have still immense progress to make. There a field exists vast enough for my ambition and sufficient to satisfy it.

"It was difficult for me to come to an understanding with England on the subject of Central Italy, because I was bound by the peace of Villafranca. As to Southern Italy, I am free from engagements, and I ask no better than a concert with England on this point, as on others; but, in Heaven's name, let the eminent men who are placed at the head of the English government lay aside petty jealousies and unjust mistrusts.

"Let us understand one another in good faith, like honest men as we are, and not like thieves who desire to cheat each other.

"To sum up, this is my innermost thought. I desire that Italy should obtain peace, no matter how, but without foreign intervention, and that my troops should be able to quit Rome

without compromising the security of the Pope. I could very much wish not to be obliged to undertake the Syrian expedition, and, in any case, not to undertake it alone; firstly, because it will be a great expense, and secondly, because I fear that this intervention may involve the Eastern question; but, on the other hand, I do not see how to resist public opinion in my country, which will never understand that we can leave unpunished, not only the massacre of Christians, but the burning of our consulates, the insult to our flag, and the pillage of the monasteries which were under our protection.

"I have told you all I think, without disguising or omitting any thing. Make what use you may think advisable of my letter.

"Believe in my sincere friendship.  
"NAPOLEON."

No one is deceived by the assurances of this letter with respect to the French armaments, and the return to the English alliance which it announces; and the adoption of English policy for Italy and the East were probably never intended to last longer than what is hoped to be only the temporary union of Germany.

It would be premature to speak of the efforts which the Regent is said to be making to bring about the reconciliation of Russia and Austria; but the effects which the union of Germany, upon the bases laid at the conversation at Töplitz, has already produced in Italy are visible, and will be found related in the next chapter.

### *The Revolution in Italy.*

About one month after Garibaldi had virtually wrested Sicily from the Neapolitan Bourbons, the Revolution gained Naples itself; June 24, the king found himself obliged to restore the constitution which his father had created and destroyed, to grant a general amnesty, to make a total change in his ministry, to offer an alliance offensive and defensive with Piedmont, and as the symbol of all this—for nothing can be done in Italy except under some outward and visible banner—to adopt the Italian tricolor with the Neapolitan royal arms in the centre, and to promise analogous concessions to Sicily. The prestige of the government had been

previously much weakened by a peremptory refusal of France and England to guarantee the integrity of its continental states, and by its being compelled to restore two Sardinian vessels which had been captured while conveying reinforcements to Garibaldi. Two well-known liberals, Spinelli and Marlino, were intrusted with drawing up the new programme of affairs.

June 25. The new state of things was proclaimed; the next day riots broke out in Naples. June 27, Baron Brenier, the French ambassador, was struck in his carriage; some say that the cause was not political, but only domestic. However this might have been, yet since it was then generally supposed that France was the adviser of the Neapolitan movements, and that Spinelli was adopted as Napoleon's instrument to carry out the Villafraanca idea of an Italian federation, which had miscarried through the opposition of Cavour, the event acquired a political importance. The next day, June 28, the whole city was in a commotion, the twelve police-offices of Naples were simultaneously attacked, and their archives burnt, whereby the amnesty was extended to the police as well as their victims, except to some forty unlucky agents who were caught and murdered by the mob. Hereupon the city was declared in a state of siege, and the castle of St. Elmo was garrisoned by the foreign troops. The state of siege was removed July 4, when the constitution of 1848 was proclaimed, or rather its legal existence admitted, and the Chambers were convoked for Sept. 10.

But the Italian Liberals and Unitarians feared the consolidation of the present Neapolitan measures as much as they feared the effects of reforms in the Papal States, and therefore they set themselves with the utmost cynicism to oppose measures which they knew and confessed to be good, because these measures, by insuring the existence of the present distribution of power in Italy, would impede the attainment of their ultimate object, Italian unity, which they evidently seek less for the sake of good government and liberty than of power. Accordingly, the offers of the Neapolitan alliance were received with popular derision in Piedmont,

and with violent denunciations against all Bourbons in the Chambers at Turin; if the ministers showed themselves more mild, it was only to gain time, or to affect obsequiousness to the advice of France and the demands of Russia and Spain. On the news of the amnesty reaching Piedmont, the Neapolitan exiles at once set out for their country; their landing at Naples, July 7, led within a week to an outbreak which committed the young king yet further to the course he had adopted. July 15, there was a popular demonstration to celebrate the return of the exiles; the royal guard fired upon the people, with shouts of "Down with the Constitution!" The ministers resigned in a body; but the king disowned the act of his guards, and his ministry therefore retained their places; but two regiments of the royal guard were removed from the city, and the national guard was substituted. Illuminations and proclamations followed, as they always do on these occasions. The ministry followed up the advantage they had thus gained, and, July 23, General Nunziante, and the chief members of the Camarilla, which the young king inherited from his father, were dismissed. All this time the Piedmontese party had been gradually gaining ground in the kingdom, till it was evidently possible that Garibaldi, the herald of the Sardinian *statuto* of Italian unity, could march into Naples whenever he chose. He agreed, however, with his chief partisans to put off his attack till after the convocation of the Chambers, when, if the majority was annexationist, as expected, it would be possible to legalise beforehand by a vote a measure that would otherwise be nothing but a *coup-de-main*.

The career of Garibaldi in Sicily, uniform in military success, has been politically checkered. Appearing in the island as the champion of Italian unity, and the agent, understood though disowned, of the cabinet of Turin, he surprised every one by suddenly arresting and banishing from Sicily M. Lafarina, the agent of Cavour, July 7. It must be remembered that Lafarina was one of the Sicilian leaders in 1848, and is the author of the popular revolutionary history of the Italians. Lafarina summed up his differences with Gari-



baldi as follows: "Lafarina believed in the necessity of the immediate union of Sicily to Piedmont; Garibaldi that it should be put off till the whole of Italy, including Venice and Rome, was liberated. Lafarina objected to several of Garibaldi's ministers, some because of their inconstancy, and some as Mazzinians or Bourbonists; whereas Garibaldi sought to unite all elements for the national cause. Lafarina thought it strange that Garibaldi should abuse Cavour, neglect those Sicilians who had supported the Revolution in 1849, should overthrow the whole administrative organisation, close all the tribunals, refuse to form any police force, make unknown or ill-known men governors of provinces, set his face against the national guard; should alarm Sicily by making Palermo the hotbed of all the most incorrigible Mazzinians of Italy; should threaten to put to death a journalist who wrote against Mazzini, but allow the *Precursore* to say that Piedmont would only give up Sicily to the Bourbons again to purchase their alliance." After this quarrel, Cavour sent M. Depretis to be his agent with Garibaldi instead of Lafarina. Several of Garibaldi's ministry resigned, and their places were filled up with known Mazzinians.

After the fall of Palermo (May 27) had secured the west of Sicily to Garibaldi, he spent six weeks in organising his forces for attacking the strong places still held by the Neapolitans in the east, namely, Messina with its advanced post, the peninsula of Melazzo in the Straits, and Agosta and Syracuse in similar relations further south. At Messina there were about 14,000 men under General Clary, and a garrison of some 1500 at Melazzo. But the Neapolitans only held the two towns and the road between them. The Italian tricolor floated outside their lines, and the secret national committee of Messina sat at Barcelona, a few miles west of Melazzo, where they gathered the nucleus of a national force, which the Neapolitans neglected to sweep away while they could. Garibaldi despatched Colonel Medici (July 12) to organise these materials; and at the same time Naples showed symptoms of being

about to lose the command of the sea, through the desertion of the *Veloce* and the general refusal of the crews of other vessels to act against Italians.

In this state of things, Clary wished to abandon Melazzo, and concentrate his forces in and around Messina, again taking possession of the heights which he had abandoned, but from which the town and citadel might be bombarded. However, the views of Colonel Bosco, a Sicilian, prevailed, and a column of 4000 men was sent out under him to meet the enemy near Melazzo. Some skirmishing took place on the 17th and 18th without any decided results, and the Neapolitans took up their flank position for the protection of Messina under the shelter of the guns of Melazzo, exhibiting therein the feeblest possible amount of strategy.

On the 18th, General Cosentz arrived with his seasoned troops from North Italy; and the next day Garibaldi appeared with about 1200 men on board the *City of Aberdeen*, and prepared to attack the garrison of Melazzo the next day. On the 20th was fought the battle which decided the fate of Messina. The castle and town of Melazzo are situated on a narrow peninsula, connected with the mainland by a neck of low land, towards which some great roads converge on a parallelogram about four miles long and two and a half deep. The land between these roads is thickly planted with vines, olives, and canes, which gave excellent cover to the Neapolitan sharpshooters. Through this Garibaldi, with an attacking force of about 5000 men, gradually made his way, and took the town after fourteen hours' fighting. On the 25th, Colonel Bosco surrendered the citadel, with 50 guns, 139 horses, and 100,000 rounds of ammunition. The attacking force was materially assisted by the fire of the ex-Neapolitan frigate *Veloce*.

On the 27th, Colonel Medici found the heights above Messina abandoned, and so he marched into the town, which was also evacuated; and the next day a convention was signed with General Clary for an armistice, the Neapolitans to retain the citadels of Messina, Agosta, and Syracuse. From this moment Garibaldi's preparations were all directed to an

invasion of the continental states of Naples.

About this time the King of Sardinia, under pressure of fears occasioned by the attitude of Austria, since her understanding with Prussia at Töplitz, wrote to Garibaldi, ordering him not to cross the straits, nor to foment troubles in Umbria and the Marches, or to give any assistance to any such undertaking, which would not only be useless to the common cause, but would also drag the King into the greatest difficulties with the Powers most favourable to Italy. He declared that he did not wish to be King of Sicily, and that he should not be sorry to see the island under the rule of a member of the reigning family of Naples.

At the same time Farini went to Genoa to prevent the embarkation of several expeditions that were upon the point of sailing for Naples and the Papal States. But the Italian Liberals have got beyond the power of Count Cavour. Garibaldi answered the King plainly that he did not hold his commission from him. Nevertheless, the wishes of the sovereign seem to have made some impression upon him; for the *Times* Correspondent, who has the best information, writes this August 1:

"In the interview of to-day Garibaldi laid down for the first time the conditions under which he would consent to stop in his career of victory. A prolongation of the armistice for five days was agreed upon, and General Clary leaves this evening for Naples to carry there the conditions. He is to be back on the evening of the 5th inst.

"As for the conditions, their aim is to unite the north and south of Italy for all practical purposes, without actually driving away the Bourbons. The question is neither more nor less than of a kingly brotherhood, the assimilation of their two kingdoms, one policy and one army. Of course, in this union Victor Emmanuel, as the eldest of the two in the path of Italian independence and freedom, is to have the command of the whole army, and the lead in the Italian policy to be pursued; Naples to follow, and to be assimilated to Italy, retaining, however, its reigning family. As a first step in this as-

similation, an exchange of troops—Italian troops to Naples, and the Neapolitans to the North, to undergo a healthy transformation, and thus become national troops. The navy *idem*. The constitution adapted to that in force in Upper Italy. The custom-house line between the two portions of Italy abolished."

Aug. 4. The Sardinian *statuto* was proclaimed for Sicily.

During this whole time Naples had been in a state which allowed every man to do as he pleased. Garibaldian journals were printed; Garibaldian committees organised; the army and the navy were enticed from their allegiance; the Count of Syracuse and other members of the royal family fraternised with the Unitarians, and declared for Piedmont; and it appeared certain that the conquest of Naples would be even easier for Garibaldi than the conquest of Sicily had proved to be; when the same events that had frightened Victor Emmanuel encouraged Francis II. to stand up manfully for the few remaining prerogatives of his position. About the middle of August, it was confidently asserted that an Austrian note existed, threatening the Court of Turin that any further complicity in the measures of Garibaldi would be reckoned a *casus belli*, and that the Romagna would be occupied with Austrian troops. It was further rumoured that, as Garibaldi had publicly announced his intention of attacking Venice, with the Neapolitan fleet, after he had taken Naples, Austria was determined to defend herself at Naples, and to attack Garibaldi as soon as he crossed over from Messina.

These threats, coupled with the consciousness that the Sardinian army had been fearfully weakened in the last war, and since that by the loss of the Savoyards, and by the numerous desertions that had taken place of men who went to serve under Garibaldi, induced the government of Turin to issue orders to its provincial governors to prevent any preparations for the invasion of neighbouring states. Farini went to Genoa and succeeded in stopping an expedition which was destined for the Papal States. M. Bertani was sent to Sicily to speak with



Garibaldi; and Garibaldi seems to have left Sicily on the 12th in a Sardinian frigate.

Francis II., on the other hand, saw that the time was come to attempt to arrest his fall. He ordered that the constitutional laws for the repression of the licenses of the press should be put in force; he suppressed three journals hostile to his government; he dissolved the electoral committees, whose object it was to secure the election of Unitarian representatives to the Chambers; reinforced the garrison of the city; notified to the governments his intentions to fire upon any vessel, under any flag, that might attempt to land men on his shores; and finally declared Naples in a state of siege.

And so the situation remains, Aug 18.

#### *The Papal States.*

The Papal States have had to play no part in the events of the last two months; they have been quiet, with the exception of some insignificant agrarian disturbances at Monteporzio. All accounts agree, however, in describing the population as ready to rise whenever Garibaldi has gained Naples, and in affirming that the Italian portion of Lamoricière's army, with the exception of the gendarmes, is entirely untrustworthy. Most of the stories to the disadvantage of the Irish contingent are ridiculous exaggerations, and the best authorities agree in describing the little Franco-Hibernian battalion as the *élite* of the whole body. But though Lamoricière's army is thought too weak to guard the States, the French garrison is abundantly sufficient to guarantee the personal security of the Pope, and his possession of Rome; and beyond this neither the pamphlet *Le Pape et le Congrès*, nor Napoleon's letter to M. de Persigny, pretends to promise him.

The despatches of Mr. Lyons, describing the condition of the States between 1854 and 1857, which are the most valuable contributions to the Roman question, make one thing abundantly clear,—that however willing the Papal government were to make reforms, all were impossible because the Liberals would not accept them. The discontent was not against definite grievances, but against the Pa-

pal system; and grievances were popular because they made the system unpopular, and because they proved that a clerical government is unsuited to an age of civilisation and progress. So it was in Tuscany: the Grand Duke was driven away because he was an Austrian; the Pope is to be dethroned because he is a priest, with very little respect to the quality of their governments.

The only remedy that Mr. Lyons had to propose for this was, the secularisation of the government. But Cardinal Antonelli could never be brought to see that this would differ from the abolition of the Papal rule altogether. As the Pope is an ecclesiastic, he said, his government must be ecclesiastical.

But this secularisation of the government was not to be the precursor of free institutions. Instead of the restoration of the old municipal liberties, the Liberals only had the introduction of the Code Napoleon and of the conscription (a measure which Cardinal Antonelli ardently desired) into the States. Of course the religious foundations would go, as they have gone in Piedmont, and the division of property would in a few generations extinguish the nobility.

"The views of the clergy and of the mass of the laity, in matters of government, seem to have become irreconcilably opposed; an antipathy of caste has grown up between them, wholly irrespective of belief or disbelief in the Roman Catholic religion." The prelates who have posts in the government may, indeed, sometimes be laymen; "but whether he takes orders or not, a man who enters the *prelatura* is understood to pledge himself to the civil supremacy of the clergy. He is expected not only to dress as a churchman, but to think and act as one."

"I agree with M. de Rayneval in believing that the disaffected do not desire the reform, but the overthrow of the government. The more ardent and intelligent Romans, like other Italians, feel humiliated by the poor part their country plays in the world. They believe that under the temporal rule of the Popes things can never be otherwise. The mode in which the clerical system was restored has made it odious to them.

..... Their standard of value for a scheme of reform, is the means it would supply for throwing off the yoke of the Holy See. They willingly enter upon the long list of their grievances against the administration; they love to dwell upon them, and to exaggerate them; but they listen with manifest impatience to any proposal for remedying them under the present rule. I had almost said, that they do not desire to see them remedied; that they would be sorry to have fewer causes of complaint—sorry for any thing that would diminish the extent or the intenseness of the disaffection."

In these words Mr. Lyons sets up a monument to the infamy of the Italian Liberals which history will note. On the whole, his despatches confirm all the *facts* of M. de Rayneval's celebrated memoir, though of course he finds enough differences of opinion, and enough objections to details, to eke out a despatch. This is no more than a rival diplomatist is necessitated to do.

July 13. The Pope made an allocution, deploring the blows aimed at his authority and against religion "by the unjust usurpers of legitimate power in Italy." The Subalpine government having usurped Parma and Piacenza on the 19th of April, drove out the Benedictines from Parma, and (May 10) closed the Seminary at Piacenza because the Bishop refused to sing the *Te Deum*; the Bishop was afterwards arrested, carried out of his diocese to Turin, fined and imprisoned, as were also the Vicar-General and some of the Canons.

In the Æmilian and other provinces "subject to the unjust dominion of the Cisalpine government," Bishops, ecclesiastics, and religious have been subjected to a harsh inquisition, and not a few arrested, exiled, or imprisoned. The Provicar of Bologna was carried away from the Cardinal-Archbishop's deathbed, fined, and imprisoned. On the death of the Archbishop, the revenues of the see were taken by the government; the Bishop of Faenza was fined and imprisoned; the Cardinals Archbishop of Pisa, Bishop of Imola, and Archbishop of Ferrara were all imprisoned or persecuted.

In Sicily two religious orders were

suppressed (Jesuits and Redemptorists), and some ecclesiastics scandalously took part in the government that did this wrong. And in the provinces annexed to Sardinia many of the sees are vacant. Hence it is abundantly clear, that the wish to destroy the temporal power of the Pope is only a means to an end, and that end is the destruction of the Church.

### *Syria.*

The massacres in Syria, instead of being, as usual, the mere vendettas of hostile tribes, have this year been raised into an event of European significance by the state of the Turkish empire; for their magnitude and atrocity are far too great to be referable to local causes alone; but they are immediately connected with the general condition of the empire,—the state of popular feeling, the weakness of government, the vicious administration, the public bankruptcy, and a strong impression that Europe will never unite to put an end to the general mismanagement.

The last great war between the Druses and Maronites was concluded in 1845. The first symptoms of the new outbreak occurred in the summer of 1859, when a skirmish occurred between the Druses and Maronites at Beit Mizi, near Beyrout, one Sunday afternoon; several persons were killed, but a perfect reconciliation was proclaimed.

Early in May 1860, the Druses murdered a monk in a convent between Beyrout and Deir-el-Kammar. The Christians retaliated by killing the first Druse they found. Then the Druses killed two Christians, whose relations in return killed two Druses, according to the native law of blood-feuds.

At this time the government might easily have stopped all further mischief if the slightest trouble had been taken; but nothing was done. War broke out May 28, on which day thirty-two villages were seen burning from Beyrout. Consul-General Moore said, May 29, that as far as he had then learned, the contest began by a body of Christians in the Meten attacking three mixed Druse and Christian villages, and driving therefrom the Druse inhabitants. This information has been eagerly seized



upon in the House of Commons, where, in spite of the horrors they have committed, the Druses are the favourites, not to justify, but to palliate their conduct. Lord Palmerston also believes the Druse stories of the committee of Maronite Bishops in Beyrout being at the bottom of all the disturbances. It is only a prejudiced eye that could read thus the papers that have been laid before Parliament. On the 29th, the Druses marched to within forty minutes of Beyrout, and in the face of Kurschid Pasha and all his camp (for he had gone out on pretence of stopping the war), murdered, burnt, and plundered in the village of Hadad, the Turkish soldiers firing upon the Christians. The refugees from the burnt villages were cut to pieces by Druses and irregular troops near Beyrout, May 30 or 31.

*May 29.* Hasbeya, a large town under Mount Hermon, was attacked; Othman Bey, the Turkish commander, invited the Christians into the Serai for greater security, and got them to deliver up their arms, which he allowed to fall into the hands of the Druses. For a week they remained there with hardly any food or water, till on the 5th of June the Druses were let in upon them, who slaughtered every male over five years old; the Turks slaughtering those who escaped the Druses, except some fifty who hid themselves under dead bodies. "Women," says Mr. Graham, "the Druses did not slaughter, nor for the most part ill-use; that was left for Turks and Moslems to do, and they did it." The sister of the Druse chief had advised the Christians not to enter the Serai, but they unhappily mistrusted her. 400 who put confidence in her were saved, and have been conveyed to Beyrout.

Next the Christians at Sidon suffered, entirely at the hands of the Moslems and Turks, especially the Bashi-Bazouks.

*June 3.* Deir-el-Kammar, the ancient capital of the Lebanon, with a population of about 7000, was attacked, but the Druses were repulsed; but the next day the Christians solicited peace, which was granted; but the Druses made their own terms. Life was safe within the walls, but all movable property was plundered,

and those who ventured outside the town were cut down. Next, June 19, Zaleh, with a population of 10,000, was taken; the bulk of the people had gone out to surprise the attacking army, but arrived at the pass only in time to see their town in flames. Ottoman troops took part in this business also.

After this, the tragedy of Hasbeya was reënacted at Deir-el-Kammar. The Turkish governor persuaded the Christians to give up their arms, and invited them into the Serai, where about 1200 males were butchered, and the women horribly abused by the Turkish soldiery. After this the town was burnt. Mr. Graham has visited the place since, and has described it in a despatch to Lord Dufferin.

The same thing was about to take place at Sidon, where the Turkish authorities had also disarmed the Christians, June 26; but the catastrophe was prevented by the presence of two English and two French men-of-war.

After the events of Deir-el-Kammar, the European consuls at Beyrout, who up to this time had communicated only with Kurschid Pasha, opened communications with the Druse chiefs, who "clearly showed they had not been the chief agents in the mountain war, but had sold themselves to the Pashas." After this was made clear, Kurschid Pasha forced the Druses and Christians to accept a pacification, the only article of which was that "bygones should be bygones." Up to the time of this pacification, sixty towns and villages of the Lebanon had been destroyed, and 75,000 persons, many of them accustomed to the luxuries of civilisation, rendered destitute. The murders are estimated at 4000; namely, 1200 at Deir-el-Kammar, at Hasbeya and Rasheya 700, at Sidon 505; above 200 refugees cut down near Beyrout, May 30; and about 1000 in the villages; but all these males.

Almost on the day on which peace was proclaimed in the Lebanon, massacres began at Damascus, where there were about 130,000 fanatical Moslems to about 15,000 Christians. The attack began July 9, in the afternoon; the house of the Russian consul was the first to be attacked; then some of the houses of the leading Christian

merchants were burnt. The mob then began to burn the whole Christian quarter systematically. The Europeans found shelter either with Abd-el-Kader or with Mr. Brant, the English consul. The Arabs and Khurds were allowed to enter the gates, and they assisted the fanatical mob of the capital in murdering the men and insulting and carrying off the women.

The Christian quarter, says Mr. Brant, was set fire to on Monday the 9th, and was still burning on Sunday the 15th; every church and convent was plundered and afterwards burnt; those that were rich in plate were not plundered by the rabble, but by the soldiers. Abd-el-Kader's few Algerines found it possible to save numbers, while Achmet Pasha declared it was impossible for him to do so. The Pasha also, though repeatedly urged, neglected to have the gates guarded. When Othman Bey, the butcher of Hasbeya, returned to Damascus, Achmet received him with an ovation; and if the Moslem Emir Shohab with his family was killed at Hasbeya, it is noticed that he was a personal enemy of the Pasha of Damascus, and was slaughtered, it may be supposed, not without the consent of Achmet. Captain Paynter reports the loss at 1,200,000*l.* sterling; "2000 dead bodies (or, according to Mr. Brant, from 3000 to 5000) were to be seen among the ruins, and 20,000 houseless wanderers (this must be an exaggeration, as the whole Christian population was put down at 15,000), whose only crime was that they were followers of Christ, now live on charity, and ask for justice from the hands of Europe."

On Wednesday, July 17, Fuad Pasha, the minister for foreign affairs at Constantinople, arrived at Beyrout with troops, as commissioner extraordinary from the Porte. He sent off the Pasha of Beyrout and Othman Bey, and, Aug. 4, declared that he had already arrested more than 400 persons guilty of having taken part in the massacre, and by the next day hoped to have the notables who had been compromised in his power. He had named an extraordinary commission, and those found guilty were to be immediately executed. A great part of the plunder, furniture and valuables, had been recovered. All these

were fine words; but Aug. 14, Lord Stratford de Redcliffe read a letter from Smyrna in the House of Lords to the effect that Kurschid Pasha had arrived, not under arrest or in any disgrace, but in full possession of his honours, and with his flag flying. Hence, he said, he feared that unless care was taken, these measures will stop with the mere repression of the local disturbances; perhaps on the same footing as Kurschid's "pacification" of the Lebanon, on the basis of "oblivion of the past."

It has since been reported that the offending Pashas, who had been sent to Constantinople to be tried, have been degraded, and sent back to Beyrout and Damascus to be tried by mixed commissions.

Ever since the first news of these massacres reached the west of Europe, June 28, the courts of the great powers have been in the greatest excitement. In France the old dream of an independent Egypt under Mehemet Ali reappeared in favour of an independent Syria under Abd-el-Kader. On the other hand, Prussia and Austria agreed at Töplitz that the Turkish empire was to be maintained as long as possible, and in England Lord John Russell steadily adhered to the policy of Lord Stratford; so steadily, indeed, that at one time it seemed likely to lead us into a war with France, and the Porte professed that he only consented to the intervention of the powers in Syria in order to prevent a collision between France and England. The Sultan himself wrote to the French Emperor, July 19, announcing the nomination of Fuad Pasha as extraordinary commissioner, and plainly claiming the right to settle the Syrian affairs in his own way. "Let your majesty be convinced that I shall employ all my powers for establishing security and order in Syria, and that I shall severely punish the guilty parties, whoever they may be, and render justice to all."

The Emperor of the French was obliged to yield to the opposition of all the other Powers against taking the matter out of the hands of the Porte; and, Aug. 3, the representatives of the Five Powers and of Turkey signed protocols at Paris, announcing the Sultan's acceptance of the proffered aid of the other Pow-



ers; their troops not to exceed 12,000 men, half to be furnished immediately by France; the commander of the expedition to act in concert with Fuad Pasha; the Powers to maintain a "sufficient" fleet on the coast; the occupation to determine in six months, and the Sultan to afford every facility for victualling the expedition. The second protocol was a declaration that "the contracting Powers do not intend to seek for, and will not seek for, in the execution of their engagements, any territorial advantages, any exclusive influence, or any concession with regard to the commerce of their subjects such as could not be granted to the subjects of all other nations." This was backed up by a recommendation to the Porte to fulfil "the solemn promises" of 1856, "that serious administrative measures should be taken to ameliorate the condition of the Christian population of every sect in the Ottoman empire." In these conditions Lord Stratford regrets two things: that the Turks were not obliged themselves to put down the disturbances in the first instance; and that no sufficient time was given them to do so. If it had been, and they had failed, then the European troops might have come in with greater effect and propriety. He evidently does not expect that the intervention will end in six months, and he demands that the most stringent measures which international law sanctions shall be adopted to interpose a barrier between the races, the contention between whom occasioned these events. He hopes that they will no longer be allowed to occupy the same mixed villages, where quarrels are engendered, and the Turkish officers have opportunities either of interference or non-interference, both equally disastrous.

The Emperor of the French seems to entertain the same opinion as Lord Stratford of the futility of the limitations of the protocols. When he sent his contingent from the camp at Chalons, he told them that though they did not leave in great numbers, their courage and their prestige would supply the deficiency, because wherever the French flag is seen to pass, nations know that a great cause precedes it, and *a great people follows it*. Which last words may mean any

thing up to a grand national emigration of France into Syria.

August 20. In reply to Mr. Mon-sell, Lord Palmerston pointed most distinctly at France as the instigator of the disturbances in Syria. Some months ago large quantities of arms were conveyed to Syria and placed in the hands of the Christians, and a newspaper has for some time been published under the auspices of the French Government, in the Arabic language, which has contained the most inflammatory articles. This is part of the policy pursued by France throughout the Turkish dominions, where it is constantly keeping up the feud between the Christians and the Turks. "Nothing," said the Count de Morny, on the 11th July, "nothing contributes more to induce a country to surrender itself (*se livrer*) to him who brings order and authority than the spectacle of revolutionary disorders, and nothing contributes more to induce France to preserve the government she has given herself." But in order to keep alive this sentiment of gratitude and devotedness, it is necessary to renew continually the impression of the merits of the government in restoring right and order. The spectacle of disorders must be frequently revived, that the government may have the opportunity of earning new claims to submission. It must incite aspirations which it may have the credit of satisfying, and create disturbances for the sake of composing them. New knots have to be perpetually tied, that there may be a call for the sublime agent who has the gift of unravelling them. But as all internal movement is dangerous to the stability of the throne, these opportunities must be sought abroad. Every little complication and weakness is therefore assiduously cultivated, every sore place is rubbed to inflammation, and the skeletons in all men's houses are made to exhibit an unusual and most annoying restlessness. There is that capital principle of nationality with which every State may be disturbed in its turn by that power which possesses the most compact national character in Europe. The great cause of Christianity and civilisation is a still better card, but it can only be played with effect in the East. If the sick man should

die or mend, it will be a sad day for the charlatan who turns his ailments to so much account. Meantime the Emperor is to enjoy the reward of his intrigues in the East, and those who opposed the Syrian policy of France in 1840 look rather foolish. A great performer on that occasion, Sir Charles Napier, has done public penance for the achievements by which he then acquired the fame which he has not since increased, and when a member declared in the House of Commons that he regretted the part England had taken in the Crimean war, he was cheered by the Tories.

But the evil is neither in the convention of 1840 nor in the Crimean war. The cause of the present troubles lies in the policy which was pursued after 1840 in Syria, and in the peace which concluded the late war. The Christians and the Druses lived formerly in peace together under a chief who belonged to neither party, and who was almost independent of the Sultan. This must be remembered when we are told, by Lord Palmerston and others, that the cause of the present outbreak is the weakness of the central power. That power was almost unknown in the Lebanon during the peaceful dominion of the Emir Beshir. No other European state has respected in modern times the self-government of the provinces so much as the Turks. As in the provinces of the Roman empire, the fall of the republic was felt as a blessing, and the reign even of tyrannical emperors was more tolerable than the period of republican proconsuls, so the various national groups that have been subject to the Turks have enjoyed a species of independence which seems inconsistent with the despotic character of the central rule. This is applicable partly by the union of national and religious resistance in so many tribes, which the Turks could never entirely subdue, and which, as polygamists, they were unable to absorb.

Spain, on the other hand, systematically destroyed the elements of autonomy in most of her dependencies. Naples, for instance, would be incapable of a political regeneration like that of Greece.

Then, the machinery of government in Turkey is somewhat bar-

barous. An efficient despotism must rely on centralisation, and centralisation presupposes ample means of communication. All this is wanting; civilisation still stands at a mediæval point, and mediæval civilisation presents material as well as moral obstacles to despotism which are insurmountable. This mediæval state of society subsists in all its purity in the mountainous districts of Syria.

From the insecurity of life and property, all the towns are in the mountains, whilst the plains are abandoned to the nomad Bedouins. The towns and villages are a kind of fortress; even the monasteries have an almost warlike appearance. A feud between monks of different monasteries has sometimes ended in loss of life. The house of the Bishop of Sachleh, who has now lost his life, was more like an arsenal than an episcopal residence. A traveller describes him going out to battle, in armour and on horseback, with a red turban on his head, the cross and the crozier borne before him, and his warriors behind. It is a scene of the Crusades. But religion has made extraordinary progress of late years, through the apostolic efforts of the Jesuits and Lazarists; civilisation and wealth are increasing at the same time, and the distance between the Christians and the Druses has grown greater and greater. They belong to different ages, and religion is only a secondary element in their quarrel. These causes have only become powerful of late years, and simultaneously the action of the great Powers and the policy of the Turks have aggravated their effect. For the Turks have forgotten in the hour of their weakness and decline the generosity and forbearance of former times, when their power was at its height, and was wielded by princes of extraordinary vigour. Immunities and rights which were respected then, because they were harmless, are formidable now. The Sultans have grown more despotic as they grow more feeble. The attempts to enslave the Slavonic and Roumanic provinces in Europe were baffled by Russia and the other states. Greece was liberated by the naval powers, and Egypt preserved, thanks to two able men, much of the independence that had been en-



joyed by the Mamelooks. But Syria offered a more likely field for centralisation; for the inhabitants had no national connection with any European power, and France, the protector of the Syrian Christians, was humbled by the imprudence of M. Thiers. So the Turks resolved to use the Druses to break the growing consequence of the Christians, and a fierce war broke out in 1844, which presented on a more contracted scene many of the horrors that have so lately occurred. It was believed, both by Druses and Christians, that England was favourable to the former in their attack upon the Maronites, and the Christian fugitives on the coast fired on the English boats that came to save them. The same notions have been expressed lately. The English agents did in 1840 incite the Syrian population to take up arms against the army of Mehemet Ali. Finding that the Maronites were accustomed to look to France for protection, they naturally chose the Druses as the instruments of their influence in the country. Protestant missionaries, especially Americans, have also endeavoured to use them for the purpose of opposing Catholicism in the country. A speech of Lord Shaftesbury's, Aug. 6, throws some light on the disorganising part played by his friends in Turkey.

"There are now in the Turkish empire large numbers of persons falling away from the Greek and Latin churches, and some even from the body of Moslems. These persons, who are called Seceders, and are also known by the name of Proselytes, are acquiring very considerable influence and power; the Sultan has conferred on them very great privileges; they have a recognised status, and are considered one of the denominations under the protection of his government. They have likewise a representative, with free access to the person of the governor, to complain of any grievances they may experience. This has operated so largely, particularly in Constantinople, that religious liberty is making very considerable progress. I was in conversation, not long ago, with the son of a man, a converted Moslem, who has in Constantinople a large chapel where between 300 and 400 worshipers attend every Sunday, principally Mussulmans

who have embraced the Christian religion. As contrasted with the old condition of Constantinople, this is a considerable change. An American missionary, the Rev. Mr. Dickenson writes: 'The Bible is sold openly in the streets and in their mosques side by side with their Koran.' There have been established in Syria a great many denominations of a similar description, and I believe your lordships will see that the Turkish government, though weak, is not insincere, and that the Turkish central government does desire that reforms, and particularly religious reforms, should be carried to completion. But there is a large reactionary party—the old Mussulman party—who are, in a great measure, the authors of the present disturbances. That reactionary party must be overthrown, and must not receive any extraneous assistance arising out of the peculiar difficulties of the present time, and the agency now employed to put down those outrages. A very curious fact is this, that the Druses, although in hostility to the Maronites, are not hostile to them as Christians. They are hostile to the Maronites as neighbours with whom for a long time they have had grievances and quarrels; but it is a remarkable fact, that the Druses show no opposition to Christians. Although, when their blood is up and they are in conflict, they do not draw distinctions between different sects, yet to the Christians, as such, they have no hostility; and in proof of that I will read a letter from one of the most eminent American missionaries, who, writing in February from the now famous Deir-el-Kammar, says:

"'The Druses appear immovable, but very useful, in the providence of God, on account of their opening the door for Christian schools, and blunting the edge of persecution. It is very difficult to effect an entrance where they do not form a portion of the population. They are the instruments of good to others, often screening Protestants and defending their doctrines.'

"I am satisfied that we must do nothing, and allow nothing to be done, that will in any way disturb the great progress which the principle of religious liberty, and more particularly the advancement of pure

Christianity, are now making through those vast regions."

It is part of the policy of the Emperor Napoleon, not only to break down all former treaties, but to be a party to no treaty that it will not be easy or necessary to break. Last year he broke through the treaties of 1815, now he has broken through the treaties of 1856. The ninth article of the peace of Paris declares that there shall be no intervention between the Sultan and his subjects. The English government declared that the intervention could only be allowed if the Sultan consented. In Italy they would not allow it when the Sovereigns demanded it; yet in Turkey the consent of the Sultan is enough.

It is clear at least that the Hatti Houmayoum remains a dead letter, that the Turkish government could not carry it out if it would, and that the evil hour is only postponed. In a letter from the East which was read in the House of Lords by Lord Stratford, and has therefore the sanction of his high authority, there occurs the following passage:

"Another cause of mischief here is the strong impression that Europe will never unite together against the mismanagement of Turkish administration. But if the Turkish Ministers were once to see at least England and France agree together on this point, you would see them act quite differently. . . . There could not, I believe, be a better or more justifiable opportunity for making a last effort to save this country, which is sure otherwise to perish, than since the last awful occurrences in Syria have fixed public attention to such an extent. Any attempt again to patch up things in the usual diplomatic way will, you may rest assured, end in no practical result, and only postpone the evil moment. . . . The public mind has been very much excited of late by passing events, and strong apprehensions are still entertained of some eventual outbreak in the capital. Poverty and discontent prevail more or less almost among every class and community. One cannot tell what may be the result of all this without some prompt and efficient change."

On this occasion it is absurd to deny that there was want of the will as well as of the power to prevent

the disturbances. The Bishop of Jerusalem writes, July 16:

"I am convinced that the Pasha of Beyrout is at the bottom of all this, and I believe that he has acted on directions from Constantinople, not of course from the Sultan or his true friends. . . . The Effendis (at Jerusalem) have held council to decide whether they should incite the Moslems against the Christians, or not, and I believe they were almost all for preserving peace."

There is nothing in the presumption of guilt on the part of high Turkish officials to exonerate the French from the suspicion of complicity. It can have required very little exertion on either side to bring things to a crisis, and thus to hasten the approach of a still greater crisis. Instead of dying of the original disease, the Turkish empire will now die of the remedies applied to it by the peace of Paris. The expectant heirs have assumed the office of physicians only in order to hasten the catastrophe, and to be able to fix the very moment when they may divide the spoils. All the efforts of our time to secure, by a boundless expenditure of Christian blood and of treasure, the introduction of Turkey as part of the European system, have failed, and the words of Burke, spoken seventy years ago, are still true: "I have never yet heard it held forth," he said, March 29, 1791, "that the Turkish empire was ever considered as any part of the balance of power in Europe. They have nothing to do with European power; they consider themselves as wholly Asiatic. . . . They despise and contemn all Christian princes as infidels, and only wish to subdue and exterminate them and their people. What have these worse than savages to do with the powers of Europe but to spread war, destruction, and pestilence amongst them? The ministers and the policy which should give these people any weight in Europe, would deserve all the bans and curses of posterity. All that is holy in religion, all that is moral and humane, demands an abhorrence of every thing which tends to extend the power of that cruel and wasteful empire. Any Christian power is to be preferred to these destructive savages."

Times have changed, but the Turks have not changed with them.



